THIS BOOK
MUST NOT BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON LIBRARY

PARL. PAPERS
OR REFERENCE ONLY.

616974

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(AUTHORISED EDITION),

FOURTH SERIES.

FIFTH SESSION OF THE TWENTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT
OF THE
UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

4 EDWARD VII.

VOLUME CXXXVII.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWENTY-NINTH DAY OF JUNE
TO THE THIRTEENTH DAY OF JULY, 1904.

NINTH VOLUME OF SESSION

1904.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED,
UNDER CONTRACT WITH HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE,
BY
WYMAN AND SONS, LIMITED, FETTER LANE, LONDON.

8472

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/parliamentary-debates_june-29-july-13-1904_137

CHRONOLOGY OF "THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES."

THE PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY contains all that can be collected of the Legislative History of this country from the Conquest to the close of the XVIIIth Century (1803), 36 vols. The chief sources whence these Debates are derived are the Constitutional History, 24 vols.; Sir Simonds D'Ewes' Journal; Debates of the Commons in 1620 and 1621; Chandler and Timberland's Debates, 22 vols.; Grey's Debates of the Commons, from 1667 to 1694, 10 vols.; Almon's Debates, 24 vols.; Debrett's Debates, 63 vols.; The Hardwicke Papers; Debates in Parliament by Dr. Johnson, &c., &c.

THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES commence with the year 1803, and the contents are set forth in the following Chronological Table:—

HISTORY.

CONQUEST to 34 GEO. II.—1066 to 1760.

Vol. 1 to 15, 1 Will. I. to 34 Geo. II.
1066-1760

REIGN OF GEORGE III.—1760 to 1820.

Vol. 15 to 35, 1 Geo. III. to 40 Geo. III.
1760-1800

(First Parliament.)

Vol. 35	41 Geo. III.	1801
— 36	42 —	1802

(Second Parliament.)

Vol. 36	42 Geo. III.	1802-3

DEBATES.

First Series.

(Second Parliament—*continued.*)

Vol. 1 & 2	44 Geo. III.	1803-4
— 3 to 5	45 —	1805
— 6 & 7	46 —	1806

(Third Parliament.)

Vol. 8 & 9	47 Geo. III.	1806-7

(Fourth Parliament.)

Vol. 9 to 11	48 Geo. III.	1807-8
— 12 — 14	49 —	1809
— 15 — 17	50 —	1810
— 18 — 20	51 —	1810-11
— 21 — 23	52 —	1812

(Fifth Parliament.)

Vol. 24 to 26	53 Geo. III.	1812-13
— 27 & 28	54 —	1813-14
— 29 to 31	55 —	1814-15
— 32 — 34	56 —	1816
— 35 & 36	57 —	1817
— 37 — 38	58 —	1818

(Sixth Parliament.)

Vol. 39 & 40	59 Geo. III.	1819
— 41	60 —	1819-20

Second Series.

REIGN OF GEORGE IV.—1820 to 1830.

(Seventh Parliament.)

Vol. 1 to 3	1 Geo. IV.	1820
— 4 & 5	2 —	1821
— 6 — 7	3 —	1822
— 8 — 9	4 —	1823
— 10 — 11	5 —	1824
— 12 — 13	6 —	1825-6
— 14 — 15	7 —	1826

(Eighth Parliament.)

Vol. 16	7 Geo. IV.	1826
— 17	8 —	1827
— 18 & 19	9 —	1828
— 20 — 21	10 —	1829
— 22 to 25	11 —	1830

Third Series.

REIGN OF WILLIAM IV.—1830 to 1837.

(Ninth Parliament.)

Vol. 1 to 3	1 Will. IV.	1830-1

(Tenth Parliament.)

Vol. 4 to 8	2 Will. IV.	1831
— 9 — 14	3 —	1832

(Eleventh Parliament.)

Vol. 15 to 20	4 Will. IV.	1833
— 21 — 25	5 —	1834

(Twelfth Parliament.)

Vol. 26 to 30	6 Will. IV.	1835
— 31 — 35	7 —	1836
— 36 — 38	8 —	1837

REIGN OF VICTORIA—1837 to 1901.

(Thirteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	39 to 44	1	Victoria	1838
—	45 — 50	2	—	1839
—	51 — 55	3	—	1840
—	56 — 58	4	—	(a) 1841

(Fourteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	59	4	Victoria	(b) 1841
—	60 to 65	5	—	1842
—	66 — 71	6	—	1843
—	72 — 76	7	—	1844
—	77 — 82	8	—	1845
—	83 — 88	9	—	1846
—	89 — 94	10	—	(a) 1847

(Fifteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	95	10	Victoria	(b) 1847
—	96 to 101	11	—	1848
—	102 —107	12	—	1849
—	108 —113	13	—	1850
—	114 —118	14	—	1851
—	119 —122	15	—	(a) 1852

(Sixteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	123	15	Victoria	(b) 1852
—	124 to 129	16	—	1853
—	130 —135	17	—	1854
—	136 —139	18	—	1855
—	140 —143	19	—	1856
—	144	20	—	(a) 1857

(Seventeenth Parliament.)

Vol.	145 to 147	20	Victoria	(b) 1857
—	148 —151	21	—	1858
—	152 —153	22	—	(a) 1859

(Eighteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	154 to 155	22	Victoria	(b) 1859
—	156 —160	23	—	1860
—	161 —164	24	—	1861
—	165 —168	25	—	1862
—	169 —172	26	—	1863
—	173 —176	27	—	1864
—	177 —180	28	—	1865

(Nineteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	181 to 184	29	Victoria	1866
—	185 —189	30	—	1867
—	190 —193	31	—	1867-8

(Twentieth Parliament.)

Vol.	194 to 198	32	Victoria	1868-9
—	199 —203	33	—	1870
—	204 —208	34	—	1871
—	209 —213	35	—	1872
—	214 —217	36	—	1873

(Twenty-First Parliament.)

Vol.	218 to 221	37	Victoria	1874
—	222 —226	38	—	1875
—	227 —231	39	—	1876
—	232 —236	40	—	1877
—	237 —242	41	—	1878
—	243 —249	42	—	1878-9
—	250 & 251	43	—	(a) 1880

(Twenty-Second Parliament.)

Vol.	252 to 256	43	Victoria	(b) 1880
—	257 —265	44	—	1881
—	266 —273	45	—	(a) 1882
—	274 & 275	45	—	(b) 1882
—	276 to 283	46	—	1883
—	284 —292	47	—	1884
—	293 —301	48	—	1884-5

(Twenty-Third Parliament.)

Vol.	302 to 307	49	Victoria	(a) 1886

(Twenty-Fourth Parliament.)

Vol.	308 & 309	49	Victoria	(b) 1886
—	310 to 321	50	—	1887
—	322 —332	51	—	1888
—	333 —340	52	—	1889
—	341 —348	53	—	1890
—	349 —356	54	—	1890-1

Fourth Series.

(Twenty-Fourth Parliament—*cont.*)

Vol.	1 to 6	55	Victoria	1892

(Twenty-Fifth Parliament.)

Vol.	7	56	Victoria	1892
—	8 to 21	57	—	1893-4
—	22 — 29	57	—	1894
—	30 — 35	58	—	1895

(Twenty-Sixth Parliament.)

Vol.	36	59	Victoria	1895
—	37 to 44	59	—	1895-6
—	45 — 52	60	—	1897
—	53 — 65	61	—	1898
—	66 — 76	62	—	1899
—	77	63	—	1899
—	78 — 83	63	—	1900
—	84	63 & 64	—	1900
—	85 — 87	64	—	1900

(Twenty-Seventh Parliament.)

Vol.	88	64	Victoria	1900

REIGN OF EDWARD VII.

(Twenty-Seventh Parliament—*cont.*)

Vol.	89	1	Edward VII.	1901
—	90 to 100	1	—	1901
—	101	1 & 2	—	1902
—	102 to 117	2	—	1902
—	118 to 128	3	—	1903
—	129 to 137	4	—	1904

HIS MAJESTY'S PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF STATE, Etc.

THE CABINET.

Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury——Rt. Hon. Arthur J. Balfour.
Lord President of the Council and President of the Board of Education——Most Hon. the Marquess of Londonderry, K.G.
Lord Chancellor——Rt. Hon. Earl of Halsbury.
Secretaries of State——
    Foreign Affairs——Most Hon. the Marquess of Lansdowne, K.G.
    Home Department——Rt. Hon. A. Akers-Douglas, M.P.
    Colonial——Rt. Hon. Alfred Lyttelton, M.P.
    War——Rt. Hon. H. O. Arnold-Forster, M.P.
    India——Rt. Hon. W. St. John Brodrick, M.P.
Chancellor of the Exchequer——Rt. Hon. J. Austen Chamberlain, M.P.
First Lord of the Admiralty——Rt. Hon. Earl of Selborne.
Lord Chancellor of Ireland——Rt. Hon. Lord Ashbourne.
President of the Board of Trade——Rt. Hon. Gerald W. Balfour, M.P.
Postmaster-General——Rt. Hon. Lord Stanley, M.P.
Secretary for Scotland——Rt. Hon. A. Graham Murray, M.P.
President of the Local Government Board——Rt. Hon. Walter H. Long, M.P.
President of the Board of Agriculture——Rt. Hon. Earl of Onslow.
Chief Secretary for Ireland——Rt. Hon. George Wyndham, M.P.
Lord Privy Seal——Most Hon. the Marquess of Salisbury.

NOT IN THE CABINET.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury——Sir A. Acland-Hood, Bt., M.P.
Financial Secretary to the Treasury——Victor Cavendish, Esq., M.P.
Secretary of the Board of Education——Sir William Anson, M.P.
Secretary to the Admiralty——E. G. Pretyman, Esq., M.P.
Lords of the Treasury——
    Lord Balcarres, M.P.
    Hon. Ailwyn Fellowes, M.P.
    H. W. Forster, Esq., M.P.
Lords of the Admiralty——
    Admiral Lord W. T. Kerr, K.C.B.
    Rear-Admiral Sir C. C. Drury, K.C.S.I.
    Rear-Admiral W. H. May, M.V.O.
    Rear-Admiral John Durnford, C.B., D.S.O.
Army Council——
    The Secretary of State for War [*in the Cabinet*].
    Lt.-Gen. Sir N. G. Lyttelton, K.C.B.
    Major-General C. W. H. Douglas.
    Major-General H. C. O. Plumer, C.B.
    Major-General Sir J. W. Murray, K.C.B.
    The Under-Secretary of State for War.
    The Financial Secretary to the War Office.
    Secretary. The Permanent Under-Secretary of State for War (Col. Sir E. W. D. Ward, K.C.B.).
Civil Lord of the Admiralty——Arthur H. Lee, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary, Foreign Office——Earl Percy, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary, Home Office——Hon. T. H. Cochrane, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary, Colonial Office——His Grace the Duke of Marlborough.
Parliamentary Secretary, India Office——Rt. Hon. Earl of Hardwicke.
Parliamentary Secretary, War Office——Rt. Hon. Earl of Donoughmore.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade——A. Bonar Law, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board——J. Grant Lawson, Esq., M.P.
Financial Secretary, War Office——W. Bromley Davenport, Esq., M.P.
Attorney-General——Sir R. B. Finlay, K.C., M.P.
Solicitor-General——Rt. Hon. Sir E. Carson, K.C., M.P.
Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland——Rt. Hon. Earl of Dudley.
The Lord Advocate——C. Scott Dickson, Esq., K.C., M.P.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster——Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Walrond, Bt., M.P.

OTHER OFFICERS OF STATE.

Judge Advocate-General——Rt. Hon. Sir F. H. Jeune, K.C.B., President Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division.
Lord Chamberlain——Rt. Hon. Earl of Clarendon.
Vice-Chamberlain——Rt. Hon. Lord Wolverton.
Lord Steward——Rt. Hon. Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery, G.C.V.O.
Master of the Horse——His Grace the Duke of Portland, K.G., G.C.V.O.
Paymaster-General——Sir Savile Crossley, Bt., M.V.O., M.P.
Comptroller of the Household——Viscount Valentia, M.P.
Treasurer of the Household——The Marquess of Hamilton, M.P.
Captain Yeomen of the Guard—Rt. Hon. Earl Waldegrave.
Lords-in-Waiting——
  Rt. Hon. Earl of Kintore, G.C.M.G.
  Rt. Hon. Earl of Denbigh.
  Rt. Hon. Lord Churchill, K.C.V.O.
  Rt. Hon. Earl Howe.
  Rt. Hon. Lord Lawrence.
  Rt. Hon. Lord Bagot.
  Rt. Hon. Lord Suffield, G.C.V.O., K.C.B.
  Rt. Hon. Lord Kenyon.

SCOTLAND.

Secretary for Scotland and Keeper of the Great Seal——Rt. Hon. A. Graham Murray.
Lord Justice-General——Rt. Hon. Lord Kinross.
Lord Advocate——Rt. Hon. C. Scott Dickson, Esq., K.C., M.P.
Lord Justice Clerk——Rt. Hon. Lord Kinsburgh, C.B.
Lord Clerk Register——His Grace the Duke of Montrose, K.T.
Lord High Commissioner——Rt. Hon. Earl of Leven and Melville.
Solicitor-General——David Dundas, Esq., K.C.

IRELAND.

Lord Lieutenant——Rt. Hon. Earl of Dudley.
Lord Chancellor——Rt. Hon. Lord Ashbourne.
Chief Secretary and Keeper of Privy Seal——Rt. Hon. George Wyndham, M.P.
Under Secretary——Sir Antony McDonnell, G.C.S.I.
Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction——President: The Rt. Hon. the Chief Secretary for Ireland; Vice-President: Rt. Hon. Horace Plunkett.
Attorney-General——Rt. Hon. J. Atkinson, K.C., M.P.
Solicitor-General——J. H. M. Campbell, Esq., K.C., M.P.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

Chairman of Committees——Rt. Hon. Earl of Morley.
Clerk of Parliaments——Sir Henry J. L. Graham, K.C.B.
Deputy Clerk of Parliaments (Clerk Assistant)——Hon. E. P. Thesiger, C.B.
Reading-Clerk and Clerk of Outdoor Committees——Edward Hall Alderson, Esq.
Counsel to the Chairman of Committees——Albert Gray, Esq.
Chief Clerk and Clerk of Public Bills——A. Harrison, Esq.
Senior Clerks——
  Peers' Printed Paper Office——C. L. Anstruther, Esq.
  Principal Clerk, Judicial Department, and Taxing Officer of Judicial Costs——J. F. Skene, Esq.
  Clerk of the Journals——W. A. Leigh, Esq.
  Principal Clerk of Private Committees——J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.
Other Clerks——W. H. Hamilton Gordon, Esq.; Hon. A. McDonnell; A. H. Robinson, Esq. (Clerk of Private Bills); H. P. St. John, Esq.; V. M. Biddulph, Esq.; Hon. E. A. Stonor; H. J. F. Badeley, Esq.; C. Headlam, Esq.; J. B. Hotham, Esq.; E. C. Vigors, Esq.; A. Tennyson, Esq.; and G. D. Luard, Esq.
Accountant and Copyist——Mr. T. A. Court.
Assistant Copyists——Mr. H. P. Norris and Mr. R. A. Court.
Messengers——Messrs. A. A. Worfell, C. E. Chizlett, A. M. Stoll, J. W. F. Locke, J. McMillan, G. Bennett, G. T. Philip.
Librarian——Edmund Gosse, Esq.
Assistant Librarian——A. H. M. Butler, Esq.
Attendant——Mr. W. Worfell.

Examiners for Standing Orders——C. W. Campion, Esq. ; J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq. ; Clerk——B. H. Fell, Esq.
Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod——Gen. Sir Michael A. S. Biddulph, G.C.B.
Yeoman Usher——Captain T. D. Butler.
Serjeant-at-Arms——Lt.-Col. Rt. Hon. Sir Fleetwood I. Edwards, G.C.V.O., K.C.B.
Deputy Serjeant-at-Arms——S. Hand, Esq.
Resident Superintendent——J K. Williams, Esq.
Shorthand Writer——W. H. Gurney Salter, Esq.
Principal Doorkeepers——Messrs. W. Chandler, E. Fox, F. Holman.
First Class Assistants——Messrs. C. Walker, J. Hedley, J. Lane, B. Gallop.
Second Class Assistants——Messrs. H. B. Strevens, G. W. Cross, W. Stopp.
Third Class Assistants——Messrs. J. Woolacott, A. A. Edney, J. F. Baum.
Messengers——Messrs. A. J. Solman, J. B. Forsyth, C. Chapman, W. Phillips, W. W. Meates.
Superintendent of Refreshment Rooms——Mr. W. Casbon.
Inspector of Police attending the House of Lords——Mr. A. Palmer.
Clerk of the Works, Houses of Parliament——Mr. C. J. Williams.
Resident Engineer, Houses of Parliament——Mr. A. P. Patey.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Clerk of the House of Commons——Sir Courtney Peregrine Ilbert, K.C.S.I., C.I.E.
Clerk-Assistant——Arthur W. Nicholson, Esq.
Second Clerk-Assistant——T. L. Webster, Esq.
Principal Clerks——
    Public Bill Office, and Clerk of Fees——W. Gibbons, Esq., C.B.
    Clerk of the Journals——W. H. Ley, Esq.
    Committee Office——R. Dickinson, Esq.
    Private Bill Office——J. H. W. Somerset, Esq.
Senior Clerks——F. St. George Tupper, Esq. ; H. C. Tower Esq. ; C. V. Frere, Esq. ; L. T. Le Marchant, Esq. ; G. C. Giffard, Esq. ; Sir E. H. Doyle, Bart.
Assistant Clerks——S. L. Simeon, Esq. ; Arthur I. Dasent, Esq. ; E. C. Howe Browne, Esq. ; Horace West, Esq. ; Henry A. Ferguson-Davie, Esq. ; Arthur H. Ellis, Esq. ; Percy A. Bull, Esq. ; F. R. Williams Wynn, Esq. ; W. E. Grey, Esq. ; F C. Holland, Esq. ; J. W. G. Bond, Esq.
Junior Clerks——H. C. Dawkins, Esq. ; R. P. Colomb, Esq. ; B. H. Fell, Esq. ; R. E. Childers, Esq. ; J. Scott Porter, Esq. ; F. C. Bramwell, Esq. ; W. T. Legge, Esq., C. R. Turner, Esq. ; W. K. Gibbons, Esq. ; A. E. A. W. Smyth, Esq. ; K. J. C. Moorsom, Esq. ; R. D. Radcliffe, Esq.
Serjeant-at-Arms——H. D. Erskine, Esq., C.V.O.
Deputy Serjeant——F. R. Gosset, Esq.
Assistant Sergeant——W. H. Erskine, Esq.
Office Messenger——Mr. C. J. H. Shearn.
Chaplain to the House——The Ven. Archdeacon Basil Wilberforce, D.D.
Secretary to the Speaker——Edward Gully, Esq., C.B.
Counsel to the Speaker——Hon. Sir E. Chandos Leigh, K.C., K.C.B.
Trainbearer——Mr. J. French.
Messenger——Mr. W. Murrell.
Collectors of Fees on Private Bills——C. L. Lockton, Esq.
Clerk to Referees——Sir E. H. Doyle, Bart.
Examiners of Private Bills——C. W. Campion, Esq. ; J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.
Taxing Master——C. W. Campion, Esq. ; Clerk——B. H. Fell, Esq.
Vote Office——
    Principal Clerk——Philip Smith, Esq.
    Assistant Clerks——H. Otway Mayne, Esq. ; John Poyser, Esq.
    Messenger——Mr. John Edwards.
Librarian——R. C. Walpole, Esq. ; Assistant Librarian——Temple Franks, Esq., B.C.L ; Clerks in Library——Messrs. J. R. Crimp, Wm. Stewart ; Messengers——Messrs. A. Firmin, W. Hague.
Shorthand Writer——W. H. Gurney Salter, Esq.
Printers——
    Journals——G. E. Briscoe Eyre, Esq.
    Votes——J. B. Nichols, Esq.
Postmaster——Mr. I. Lincoln ; Hall Keeper——Mr. J. Glynn.
Office Keeper——Mr. H. Bullock.
Office Clerk in Committee Office——Mr. T. Fielden Mitchell.
Office Clerk in Journal Office——Mr. A. A. Taylor.
Messengers——Messrs. C. Davie, H. Jones, G. D. Weller, J. Armstrong, J. Woodward J. Ivory, G. Norman, J. Surrey, A. Sepple.
Doorkeepers——Mr. M. Inglefield and Mr. H. Hambling.

Messengers (1st Class)——Mr. C. WOODCRAFT, Mr. R. ROBERTSON, Mr. J. HILLS, Mr. J. SPRAGUE, Mr. A. ANDREWS, Mr. T. B. SPRAY, Mr. G. TYE, Mr. R. HOBBY, Mr. G. ANSTEY, Mr. J. H. DAY.

Messengers (2nd Class)——Messrs. J. HENDERSON, G. WAINWRIGHT, J. GUYATT, R. TURTLE A. HASKELL, A. C. JOHNSON, G. CLAPPERTON, H. F. LININGTON, H. G. EMMETT, J. L PHILIP.

Superintendent of Members' Waiting Room——Mr. J. F. HENLEY; Assistant——Mr. W BROADBENT; Porters——Messrs. J. ORAM and J. HART.

Chief Inspector of Police attending the House of Commons——Mr. SCANTLEBURY.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

VOLUME CXXXVII.

NINTH VOLUME OF SESSION, 1904.

HOUSE OF COMMONS : WEDNESDAY, 29TH JUNE, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Page

Manchester Ship Canal (Finance Bill) [LORDS]—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment 1

Shipley Urban District Council Bill [LORDS]—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1

Saddleworth and Springhead Tramways Bill (changed from "Saddleworth and Springhead Tramways (Abandonment) Bill"). As amended, considered 1

Ordered, That Standing Orders Nos. 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed. [New Title] 1

Stretford Urban District Council Bill [LORDS].—Read a second time, and committed 2

Great Yarmouth Corporation Bill [LORDS].—Reported, with Amendments, from the Police and Sanitary Committee [Section B]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 2

Metropolitan District Railway Bill [LORDS].—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 2

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP 10).

Sir LEWIS MCIVER reported from the Committee on Group 10 of Private Bills That, for the convenience of parties, they had adjourned until Tuesday next, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table 2

June 29.] *Page*

PETITIONS.

ALIENS BILL.—Petition from Paisley, in favour; to lie upon the Table .. 2

EDUCATION (LOCAL AUTHORITY DEFAULT) BILL.—Petition from Battersea, against; to lie upon the Table 3

LAND VALUES (ASSESSMENT AND RATING) BILL—Petition from Croydon, in favour; to lie upon the Table 3

LICENSING BILL.—Petitions against; from Aberystwyth (two); Amble; Ashington; Bamber Bridge; Bamford; Battersea; Beverley; Blackburn; Blackley; Blackwood; Blundellsands; Bradford (two); Broomhill; Butterwick; Cymdy; Capel; Cardiff (two); Castleton; Cathays Park; Cawthorn; Chorlton Lane; Coombe Dingle; Coningsby; Cotherstone; Cullen; Cwmllynan; Cwmsyfiog (two); Darlington (two); Denby Dale; Dunkeld; Earlsheaton; East Dulwich; Emsworth; Ettingshall; Fareham; Fishguard; Glasgow (two); Glynceiriog; Greentown; Hanley; Hartlepool; Hawthorn Hill; Hayle; Heywood; Higher Walton; High Wycombe; Hoghton; Hopwood; Houghton-le-Spring; Hull (three); Hunslet (two); Hyde; Hyde Park; Kilmarnock; Kirkstead; Leeds (two); Leytonstone; Littlethorpe; Llansantffraid; Llansilin; London (two); Malpas; Manningham (two); Mareham-le-Fen; Middleton Cheney; Mill Hill; Mirfield; Moorside; Morley; Nelson; Newcastle-under-Lyme; New Tredegar; Niton; North Walsham; Old Charlton (five); Oswestry; Pontllanffraith; Portessie; Port Isaac; Radcliffe; Roath; Rochdale; Rock; Rock Ferry (two); Roupell Park; Sandown; Savile Town; Sheepwash; Shrewsbury; Sompting; Southdown Chale; Staveley; Sudbury (two); Sunderland; Swalwell; Thornhill; Threapwood; Throckley; Thurlstone; Todmorden; Trinant; Tumby Woodside; Tunstall; Tursdale; Ventnor; Wadebridge; Washington; Westbury-on-Trym; Wildmore; Wilmslow; Witton Gilbert; and Woodford (eleven); to lie upon the Table 3

LICENSING BILL.—Petitions for alteration; from Brighouse; Hammersmith; and Warwick; to lie upon the Table 3

LOCAL AUTHORITIES (TREASURY POWERS) BILL.—Petition from Battersea, against; to lie upon the Table 4

SHOP HOURS BILL.—Petition from Dundee, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 4

STREET BETTING BILL.—Petition from Westminster, in favour; to lie upon the Table 4

TUBERCULOSIS (ANIMALS) COMPENSATION BILL.—Petitions against; from Edinburgh; and Renfrew; to lie upon the Table 4

VALUATION BILL.—Petition from Bury, against; to lie upon the Table 4

VALUATION BILL.—Petitions for alteration; from Dorking; Hollingbourn; Rye; and Wandsworth, to lie upon the Table 4

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRANSVAAL AND ORANGE RIVER COLONY.—Copy presented, of Correspondence relating to the Finances of the Transvaal and Orange River Colony [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 4

June 29.]

Page

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP (VENTILATION IN COTTON CLOTH FACTORIES).—Copy presented, of Report to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, by F. Scudder, Esquire, F.I.C., on air tests in humid cotton weaving sheds [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 4

NATIONAL GALLERY (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Report of the Director of the National Gallery of Ireland to the Board of Governors and Guardians for the year 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 4

COUNTY OFFICERS AND COURTS (IRELAND) ACT, 1877.—Account presented, of the Receipts and Payments under the Act during the year ended the 31st March 1904 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 231.] .. 4

BOARD OF EDUCATION.—Copy presented, of Regulations for the Training of Teachers and for the Examination of Students in Training Colleges [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 5

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series. Nos. 3199 and 3200 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 5

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.—Lunacy. Copy of Fifty-eighth Report of the Commissioners in Lunacy to the Lord Chancellor [by Act]; to lie upon the Table and to be printed. [No. 232] 5

LOCAL AUTHORITIES IN SCOTLAND (TECHNICAL EDUCATION).—Return ordered, "showing the extent to which, and the manner in which, Local Authorities in Scotland have allocated and applied funds to the purposes of Technical Education during the year ending the 15th day of May, 1904, under the following Acts: Local Taxation (Customs and Excise) Act, 1890; Education and Local Taxation Account (Scotland) Act, 1892; Technical Schools (Scotland) Act, 1887; Technical Instruction Amendment (Scotland) Act, 1892; and Public Libraries Acts.")—*Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) 5

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

"THE TIMES" IN GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS.—Question, Mr. Markham (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 5

ELECTRIC RAILWAYS—PRECAUTIONS FOR PUBLIC SAFETY.—Question, Mr. Channing (Northamptonshire, E.); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 5

DELAY IN ESTABLISHMENT OF TELEPHONE SYSTEM BETWEEN BALLYMENA AND LONDONDERRY.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty (Donegal, N.); Answer, Lord Stanley 6

THE MUTESSARIFLIKS OF SELFIDGE AND KORITZA AND THE MUERZTEG AGREEMENT.—Question, Mr. Moon (St. Pancras, N.); Answer, Earl Percy 7

BRITISH COMMERCIAL AGENT AT VLADIVOSTOCK.—Question, Mr. Moon; Answer, Earl Percy 7

COMMERCIAL TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND ABYSSINIA.—Question, Major Evans Gordon (Tower Hamlets, Stepney); Answer, Earl Percy .. 7

VALUE OF LICENSED PREMISES FOR PROBATE.—Question, Mr. Corbett (Glasgow, Tradeston); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 8

June 29.]

Page

EXPORT OF COAL ABOVE THE VALUE OF 6S. PER TON.—Question, Mr. Charles Douglas (Lanarkshire, N. W.) ; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 8

INCOME TAX INQUIRY—EXEMPTION OF CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES.—Question, Mr. Louis Sinclair (Essex, Romford) ; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain .. 8

DUTY FREE SPIRITS UNDER SECTION 8 OF FINANCE ACT, 1902 —Question, Mr. Louis Sinclair ; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 8

LIQUOR AND DRUG TRAFFIC IN INDIA.—Question, Mr. Herbert Roberts (Denbighshire, W.) ; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 9

CAPTURE OF ILLIG—EXPLOSIVE BULLETS.—Question, Mr. John Redmond (Waterford) ; Answer, Mr. Arnold Forster 9

WHITE LABOUR IN TRANSVAAL GOLD MINES.—Question, Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland) ; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 9

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Question, Sir J. Stirling-Maxwell (Glasgow, College) ; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 10

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

ARMY CLOTHING FACTORY—ATMOSPHERE IN PRESSING ROOMS.—Questions, Mr. Shackleton (Lancashire, Clitheroe), Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean), and Captain Norton (Newington, W.) ; Answers, The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Mr. Bromley Davenport, Cheshire, Macclesfield) 10

THE MOWATT COMMITTEE'S REPORT.—Question, Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.) ; Answer, Mr. Bromley-Davenport 11

RECRUITMENT OF CHINESE COOLIES FOR THE TRANSVAAL.—Questions, Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar), and Mr. Charles Allen (Gloucestershire, Stroud) ; Answers, The Secretary of State for the (Colonies Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington) 12

BERI-BERI IN THE TRANSVAAL.—Questions, Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland), Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.), and Captain Norton ; Answers Mr. Lyttelton 13

THE LANDING OF COOLIES AT DURBAN.—Questions, Dr. Macnamara ; Answers, Mr. Lyttelton 15

PRESENT NUMBER OF CHINESE COOLIES IN SOUTH AFRICA.—Questions, Dr. Macnamara and Mr. Herbert Samuel ; Answers, Mr. Lyttelton 16

SOUTH AFRICAN CONSTABULARY.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke ; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 17

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUOR AND DRUGS IN INDIA.—Question, Mr. Herbert Roberts (Denbighshire, W.) ; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 17

CONCESSIONS TO EAST AFRICA SYNDICATE.—Question, Mr. Labouchere (Northampton) and Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis) ; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 18

June 29.]

Page

FINANCE REGULATIONS—ISSUES FROM THE CONSOLIDATED FUND.—Questions, Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee) and Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) .. 19

THE NEW TAXES.—Question, Mr. Edmund Robertson; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 20

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION FOR ACCIDENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.—Question, Mr. Herbert Samuel; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Cochrane, Ayrshire, N.) 20

RATTIGAN'S ESTATE, EDGEWORTHSTOWN.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell (Longford, N.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 21

MRS. LEDURTH'S ESTATE, COUNTY LONGFORD.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 21

IRISH AGRICULTURAL ORGANISATION SOCIETY.—Question, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 22

PARTY DEMONSTRATIONS IN ULSTER.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy (Cavan, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 22

IRISH DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—OFFICERS' SALARIES AND TRAVELLING EXPENSES.—Question, Mr. Murphy; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 23

WOODWORK INSTRUCTION IN IRISH SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. J. F. X. O'Brien (Cork); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 23

KINGSTON ESTATE.—Question, Mr. William Abraham (Cork County, N.E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 24

CONSTABLES' LODGING OUT—ALLOWANCES AT MILLSTREET.—Question, Mr. Sheehan (Cork County, Mid); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 24

ARBITRATOR'S AWARD FOR LAND FOR LABOURERS' COTTAGES IN THE CASTLEBLAYNEY UNION.—Question, Mr. McKean (Monaghan, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 25

INSPECTION OF WEIGHTS AND MEASURES—BALLYMAHAN GRIEVANCE.—Questions, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 26

MILLSTREET POLICE—LODGING ALLOWANCES.—Question, Mr. Sheehan; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 26

UPKEEP OF BANKS ON SIR R. BLENNERHASSETT'S KILLORGLIN ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (Kerry, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham .. 27

IRISH ASSISTANT TEACHERS' PAY.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 27

UPKEEP OF EMBANKMENTS ON ESTATES ADJOINING THE SEA.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 27

BELFAST SMALLPOX OUTBREAK.—Question, Mr. Joseph Devlin (Kilkenny, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 28

Constable Anderson, Royal Irish Constabulary.—Question, Mr. Charles Craig (Antrim, S.) and Mr. Joseph Devlin; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 29

Inquiry into the Incidence of Taxation.—Questions, Mr. Channing (Northamptonshire, E.); Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 31

Blocking Motions.—Questions, Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe), Mr. Gibson Bowles, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs), and Mr. Labouchere; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 32

The Finance Bill.—Questions, Mr. Whitley (Halifax), and Mr. Buchanan; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 33

Dean Forest Bill.—Reported, from the Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 233.]

Bill, as amended, re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House for Friday, and to be printed. [Bill 247.] 34

Selection (Standing Committees).—Mr. Halsey reported from the Committee of Selection: That they had discharged the following Members from the Standing Committee on Law, and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure; Mr. Colston and Mr. Shackleton; and had appointed in substitution, Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree and Dr. Shipman.

Report to lie upon the Table 34

Public Petitions Committee.—Ninth Report brought up, and read; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Leave given to the Committee to make a special report.

Special Report brought up, and read.

Special Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 234.] .. 34

Licensing Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. Lowther (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 1.

Amendment again proposed—

"In page 1, line 7, after the words 'ill-conducted' to insert the words 'or for not having provided suitable refreshment.'"—(*Mr. Herbert Roberts.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Page

Mr. Soares (Devonshire, Barnstaple) 35
Mr. Lough (Islington, W.) 36
Sir Robert Reid (Dumfries Burghs) 37
Major Jameson (Clare, W.) 37
Mr. Samuel Evans (Glamorganshire, Mid) 37
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 38
Sir Edward Grey (Northumberland, Berwick) 39
Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis) 40
Mr. Broadhurst (Leicester) 40
Mr. Lloyd-George (Carnarvon Boroughs) 41
Mr. Disraeli (Cheshire, Altrincham) 42
Mr. Whittaker (Yorkshire, W.R., Spen Valley) 43
Mr. Whitley (Halifax) 44
Mr. Austin Taylor (Liverpool, East Toxteth) 44
Mr. Joseph Walton (Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley) 45
Colonel Pilkington (Lancashire, Newton) 47

Question put.

The Committee divided .—Ayes, 180 ; Noes, 265. (Division List No. 181.)

Mr. J. H. Lewis (Flint Boroughs) 51

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 1, line 7, after the words 'ill-conducted' to insert the words 'or are remote from or difficult of police supervision.'"—(*Mr. J. H. Lewis.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Brigg (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley) 53
The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 54
Mr. Whittaker 55
Mr. Samuel Evans 55
Mr. Disraeli 57
Mr. McKenna (Monmouthshire, N.) 57
The Solicitor-General (Sir Edward Carson, Dublin University) 58

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 176 ; Noes, 258. (Division List, No. 182.)

Mr. Herbert Roberts (Denbighshire, W.) 63

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 1, line 7, to leave out the word 'are,' and insert the words 'that undesirable practices or methods of trading have been carried on in or in connection therewith or that the premises are insanitary or.'"—(*Mr. Herbert Roberts.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'are' stand part of the clause."

June 29.] *Page*

Mr. Austin Taylor .. 65
Mr. Whitley .. 66
Sir John Gorst (Cambridge University) .. 67
Sir Robert Reid .. 67
Sir Edward Carson .. 68
Mr. Lawson Walton (Leeds, S.) .. 70
Mr. Corbett (Glasgow, Tradeston) .. 71
Mr. Lawrence (Liverpool, Abercromby) .. 72
Sir Edward Grey .. 72
Major Jameson .. 72
Mr. Ellis Griffith (Anglesey) .. 72
Sir John Kennaway (Devonshire, Honiton) .. 73
Mr. Lloyd-George .. 73
Mr. Bousfield (Hackney, N.) .. 73
Mr. Atherley-Jones (Durham, N.W.) .. 74
Sir J. Fergusson (Manchester, N.E.) .. 74
Mr. Asquith (Fifeshire, E.) .. 75
Mr. Middlemore (Birmingham, N.) .. 75
Mr. Edwards (Radnor) .. 76
Mr. Samuel Evans .. 76
Mr. Markham (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield) .. 77
Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield) .. 78
Mr. A. J. Balfour .. 78
Mr. Asquith .. 79
Mr. Bousfield .. 79
Sir James Joicey (Durham, Chester-le-Street) .. 80
Mr. Markham .. 80
Mr. J. F. Hope (Sheffield, Brightside) .. 80

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 268 ; Noes, 190. (Division List No. 183.)

Mr. Heywood Johnstone (Sussex, Horsham) .. 85

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 7, to leave out the words 'structurally deficient or.'"—(*Mr. Heywood Johnstone.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Sir Robert Reid .. 86

Question put and agreed to.

Mr. H. D. Greene (Shrewsbury) .. 86

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 7, to leave out the words 'unsuitable or.'"—(*Mr. H. D. Greene.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'unsuitable' stand part of the clause."

June 29.]

Page
Mr. Lawson Walton 88
Mr. Markham 89
Sir Edward Carson 89
Sir Robert Reid 90

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

London County Council (General Powers) Bill (By Order).—As amended, considered.

Mr. Herbert Robertson (*Hackney, S.*) 90

Amendment proposed—

" In page 15, line 13, after the word ' require ' to insert the words, ' (2) If a person upon whom a notice has been served as aforesaid makes default in complying with any of the requisitions thereof within the time specified, the sanitary authority shall make a complaint under the Summary Jurisdiction Acts, and the petty sessional court hearing the complaint may make on such person a summary order requiring each person to comply with all or any of the requisitions of the notice.' "—(*Mr. Herbert Robertson.*)

Question proposed, " That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Heywood Johnstone (*Sussex, Horsham*) 93
Mr. John Burns (*Battersea*) 94
Mr. Bousfield (*Hackney, N.*) 95
Mr. Crooks (*Woolwich*) 95
Mr. J. W. Wilson (*Worcestershire, N.*) 96

Question put, and negatived .

Dr. Ambrose (*Mayo, W.*) 96

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

" In page 28, line 23, to leave out Clause 46."—(*Dr. Ambrose*

Question proposed, " That Clause 46 stand part of the Bill. "

Mr. John Burns (*Battersea*) 96
Mr. Heywood Johnstone (*Sussex, Horsham*) 97
Captain Jessel (*St. Pancras, S.*) 98
Mr. Lawrence (*Liverpool, Abercromby*) 98

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Bill to be read the third time.

June 29.] *Page*

Licensing Bill.—Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith, in the Chair.]

Clause 1 :—

Amendment proposed again—

" In page 1, line 7, to leave out the words ' unsuitable, or.' "—(*Mr. H. D. Greene.*)

Question proposed, " That the word ' unsuitable ' stand part of the clause."

Mr. H. D. Greene 99
Mr. Ainsworth (*Argyllshire*) 99

Question put, and agreed to.

Mr. Whitley 100

Amendment proposed—

" In page 1, line 7, after the word ' unsuitable,' to insert the words ' or of insufficient value.' "—(*Mr. Whitley.*)

Question proposed, " That those words be there inserted."

The Secretary of State for the Home Department (*Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's*) 100
Sir Robert Reid 101
Sir Edward Carson 101
Mr. Samuel Evans 101

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Bousfield 101

Amendment proposed—

" In page 1, line 7, after the word ' unsuitable ' to insert the words ' or that the licensee refuses or has wilfully neglected to comply with any reasonable requirements of the justices.' "—(*Mr. Bousfield.*)

Question proposed, " That those words be there inserted."

Sir Edward Carson 103
Sir Robert Reid 104
Mr. Stuart Wortley (*Sheffield, Hallam*) 105
Mr. Lloyd-George 105
Sir J. Stirling-Maxwell (*Glasgow, College*) 106
Mr. A. J. Balfour 107

Page
Mr. Whittaker 109
Mr. Robson (South Shields) 110
Sir James Woodhouse (Huddersfield) 112

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 146 ; Noes, 214. (Division List No. 184.)

And, it being after Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again upon Friday.

Adjourned at twelve minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS : THURSDAY, 30TH JUNE, 1904.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

North Western Electricity and Power Gas Bill.—Reported, with Amendments 117

Leicestershire and Warwickshire Electric Power Bill [H.L.].—Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to 117

City of London (Central Criminal Court House) Bill.—Moved, That the order made on the 14th day of March last, "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 16th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2^a ; agreed to. Bill read 2^a accordingly and committed. 117

Manchester Corporation (General Powers Bill) [H.L.] ; Bridlington Corporation Bill [H.L.]. Read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons .. 117

Crystal Palace District Gas Bill.—Read 3^a, with the Amendment, and passed, and returned to the Commons 117

Wolverhampton Corporation Bill.—Read 3^a, with the Amendments ; further Amendments made ; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons .. 117

Saddleworth and Springhead Tramways Bill.—Brought from the Commons ; read 1^a ; and referred to the Examiners 117

Manchester Ship Canal (Finance) Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to 117

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments to be considered to-morrow 117

Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 117

June 30.] *Page*

Preston Corporation Water Bill [H.L.]—Shipley Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to 117

Scotch Education Department Provisional Order Confirmation (Edinburgh) Bill [H.L.].—Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]. Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 118

Govan Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Caledonian Railway Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Glasgow and South-Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. Read 2ª (according to order), and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899), deemed to have been reported from the Committee. Bills to be read 3ª To-morrow 118

Wishaw Corporation Order Confirmation Bill[H.L.].—Airdrie Corporation Gas Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 118

Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill.—Read 3ª (according to order), an Amendment made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons 118

Motherwell and Bellshill Railway (Abandonment) Order Confirmation Bill; North British Railway (General Powers) Order Confirmation Bill; Paisley District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill. Read 3ª (according to order), and passed 118

Dundee, Broughty Ferry and District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill.—Order of the Day for the Third Reading, read, and discharged .. 118

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill.—London and India Docks Company Bill; Swindon Corporation Bill; Middlesbrough, Stockton-on-Tees, and Thornaby Tramways Bill; Carlisle Corporation Bill; Clyde Navigation (Works) Bill. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bills: (viz.), M. Camden, E. Mayo, V. Hampden (Chairman), L. Lovat, L. Lyveden; agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly. The Committee to meet on Friday the 8th of July next at Eleven o'clock; and all petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bills to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bill 118

Leith Corporation Tramways Order Confirmation Bill.—A message ordered to be sent to the House of Commons to propose that the Joint Committee do meet in Committee Room B on Tuesday next, at Twelve o'clock 119

Education Board Provisional Order (Cardiff) Bill.—Brought from the Commons and read 1ª; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 129.) 119

PETITIONS

SUPPLY OF ELECTRICITY BILL [H.L.].—Petitions to be heard by Counsel against; of Metropolitan Borough of St. Pancras; and Local Authorities and Companies owning Electricity Undertakings in Conference; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 119

Page

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.—Regulations for the training of teachers and for the examination of students in training colleges 119

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—No. 3199. Austria-Hungary; No. 3200. United States (New Orleans) 119

TRANSVAAL (ORANGE RIVER COLONY).—Correspondence relating to the finances of the Transvaal and Orange River Colony 119

NATIONAL GALLERY (IRELAND).—Report of the Director to the Board of Governors and Guardians, for the year 1903 119

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP VENTILATION: COTTON CLOTH FACTORIES).—Report to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, by F. Scudder, Esq., F.I.E., on air tests in humid cotton-weaving sheds 119

MINT.—Thirty-fourth Annual Report of the Deputy-Master and Comptroller of the Mint, 1903.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 120

LUNACY.—Fifty-eighth Report of the Commissioners in Lunacy, 1904 120

SUPREME COURTS OF JUDICATURE (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1875.—Order in Council of the 23rd June, 1904, appointing the Registrar of the Privy Council to be Registrar in ecclesiastical and maritime causes 120

GREENWICH HOSPITAL ACT, 1865.—Order in Council of the 23rd June, 1904, authorising an increase of salary to the cashier and store officer at the Royal Hospital School, Greenwich 120

DOCKYARD PORTS REGULATION ACT, 1865.—Order in Council of the 23rd June, 1904, defining the limits of the Dockyard Port of Dover 120

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.—Orders in Council of the 23rd June, 1904.—1. Amending the Order in Council of the 19th November, 1902, regulating the currency of Northern Nigeria; 2. Entitled the Somaliland Order in Council, 1904 120

COUNTY OFFICERS AND COURTS (IRELAND) ACT, 1877.—Account of receipts and payments under the Act, during the year ended 31st March, 1904 120

WOODS, FORESTS, AND LAND REVENUES.—The Eighty-second Report of the Commissioners of His Majesty's Woods, Forests, and Land Revenues, for the year 1903–1904 120

RAILWAY COMPANIES POWERS ACT, 1864.—Report, by the Board of Trade, on applications made during the year ended 30th June, 1904, under the Railway Companies Powers Act, 1864, and of the proceedings of the Board of Trade with respect thereto.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table .. 120

June 30.] Page

Supply of Electricity Bill [H.L.].—All Petitions referred to the Select Committee, with leave to the Committee to hear parties interested, by themselves, their counsel, agents, and witnesses, so far as the Committee think fit. The evidence taken before the Select Committee from time to time to be printed for the use of the Members of this House; but no copies thereof to be delivered, except to Members of the Committee and to such other persons as the Committee shall think fit, until further order. (No. 128.) 121

A PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

The Marquess of Ripon 121
The Lord Chancellor (The Earl of Halsbury) 121

Merchant Shipping Act (1894) Amendment Bill [H.L.]. [SECOND READING].—Order of the Day on the Second Reading read.

Lord Muskerry 122

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Muskerry.*)

Lord Wolverton 130
The Duke of Rutland 132
The Earl of Tankerville 132
The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (The Marquess of Lansdowne) 133
Lord Kelvin 134
The Earl of Wemyss 135
The Marquess of Ripon 135
Lord Muskerry 136

On Question, their Lordships divided:—Contents, 13; Not-Contents, 26.

Open Spaces Bill [H.L.]. **Merchant Shipping Bill** [H.L.]. **Reserve Forces Bill** [H.L.].—Amendments reported (according to order), and Bills to be read 3ª To-morrow 137

PRIVATE LEGISLATION PROCEDURE (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1899.—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House as the panel of Lords to act as Commissioners under the Act, viz.:—E. Mansfield, L. Kintore (*E. Kintore*); agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly 137

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Six o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: THURSDAY, 30TH JUNE, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Great Northern Railway Bill.—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 137

Matlock and District Gas Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 137

June 30.] *Page*

Selby Urban District Council Bill (BY ORDER).—Consideration, as amended, deferred till Monday next 138

Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Bill [LORDS].—Cardiff Railway Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 138

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP NO. 11).—Sir WILLIAM HOLLAND reported from the Committee on Group No. 11 of Railway Bills; That, at the meeting of the Committee this day, a letter was received from Mr. John Howard, one of the Members of the said Committee, stating that he was unable, on account of illness, to attend the Committee this day.

Report to lie upon the Table 138

Filey Improvement Bill [LORDS].—Reported, with Amendments, from the Police and Sanitary Committee [Selection B]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 138

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have agreed to—Commons Regulation (Merrow) Provisional Order Bill; Commons Regulation (Oxshott) Provisional Order Bill; Land Drainage Provisional Order Bill, without Amendment.

Southend-on-Sea Gas Bill; Brymbo Water Bill; Great Central and Midland Joint Railways Bill; Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill; Birkdale Improvement Bill, with Amendments.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confer further powers upon the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of the City of Manchester with reference to the construction of waterworks and streets, and otherwise for better local government and improvement of the city, to extend the city, and to make provision with reference to the borrowing powers of the Corporation; and for other purposes." [Manchester Corporation (General Powers) Bill [Lords.].

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to make further and better provision for the health, good government, and improvement of the borough of Bridlington; and for other purposes." [Bridlington Corporation Bill [Lords.] 138

Leith Corporation Tramways Order Confirmation Bill; That they propose that the Joint Committee appointed to consider the Leith Corporation Tramways Order Confirmation Bill, do meet in Committee Room B on Tuesday next at Twelve of the clock.

Ordered, That the Committee of this House do meet the Committee appointed by their Lordships as proposed by their Lordships

Message to the Lords to acquaint them therewith 139

Manchester Corporation (General Powers) Bill [LORDS]; Bridlington Corporation Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 139

June 30.]

Page

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.—Petitions against; from Abbots Langley; Abersychan; Alva; Ashley; Astley; Atherton; Bardney; Barkston; Balcombe; Barry; Barry Dock; Beck Row; Bell Quay on Tyne; Birkenhead (six); Bideford; Blackheath; Bridge of Allan; Bruton; Burnbank; Burnt Fen; Carthorpe; Castle Cary; Colsterworth; Commondale; Copley; Copperhouse; Cowbridge; Crowd Hill; Ditcheat; Durley; Eastleigh; Eriswell; Evercreech; Falkirk; Gateshead (two); Glasgow; Grangetown; Great Gonerby; Great Ponton; Hamilton; Harleston; Hazel Grove; Heswall; Hexham; Hinckley (two); Holywell Row; Howden; Kingsland; Kingswood; Larnyat; Leigh (four); Liverpool; London; Lower Tranmere; Mildenhall; Newcastle; Newcastle-under-Lyme; North Biddick; North Cadbury; Oakworth; Paddington; Pembroke Dock; Pentre; Pickworth; Pitcombe; Pontlothyn; Releath; Rhosyn yr Hafod; Roaches; Rochdale; Roche; Rosemelling; St. Peter's Quay; Saltfleetby; Scarlop; Soham; South Molton; South Witham; Springwell; Stenalees; Stoke-upon-Trent; Stonehouse; Stourbridge; Team Colliery; Tow Law; Usworth Colliery; Wallsend-on-Tyne; Walton le dale; Washington; Wath-upon-Dearne; West End; Weston; Woodhouse; Wrekenton; and Ynyshir; to lie upon the Table 139

LICENSING BILL.—Petition from Oxford, for alteration; to lie upon the Table .. 140

SHOPS BILL.—Petition from Grangemouth, in favour; to lie upon the Table .. 140

SHOP HOURS BILL.—Petition from Paddington, in favour; to lie upon the Table 140

VALUATION BILL.—Petitions for alteration; from Guisborough (two); and Cheltenham; to lie upon the Table 140

VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS ACT, 1897.—Petition from Sheffield, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table 140

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

RAILWAYS.—Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade on applications made during the year ended 30th June, 1904, under the Railway Companies' Powers Act, 1864, and of the Proceedings of the Board of Trade with respect thereto [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 235.] .. 140

MINT.—Copy presented, of Thirty-fourth Annual Report of the Deputy-Master and Comptroller of the Mint, 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 141

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS SECURITIES.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 16th June; Mr. Victor Cavendish]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 236.] 141

WOODS, FORESTS, AND LAND REVENUES.—Copy presented, of Eighty-second Report of the Commissioners, dated 29th June, 1904 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table and to be printed. [No. 237.] 141

DOCKYARD PORTS REGULATION ACT, 1865.—Copy presented, of Order in Council, dated 23rd June, 1904, defining the limits of the Dockyard Port of Dover [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 141

June 30.]

Page

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.—Copy presented, of order in Council of the 23rd June, 1904, entitled the Somaliland Order in Council, 1904 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 141

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.—Copy presented, of order in Council of 23rd June, 1904, amending the Order in Council of 19th November, 1902 regulating the currency of Northern Nigeria [by Act]; to lie upon the Table .. 141

GREENWICH HOSPITAL ACT, 1865.—Copy presented, of Order in Council of 23rd June, 1904, authorising an increase of salary to the Cashier and Store Officer at the Royal Hospital School, Greenwich [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 141

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1875.—Copy presented, of Order in Council of 23rd June, 1904, appointing the Registrar of the Privy Council to be Registrar in Ecclesiastical and Maritime Causes [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 141

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK (REGULATIONS).—Copy presented, of Post Office Savings Bank (Constantinople and Smyrna) Regulations, 1904 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 142

CONTINENTAL FREE PORTS.

Return ordered, " specifying the Ports on the Continent which are Free Ports and giving the following information with respect to each of these ports :

(1) Area of the Free Port.

(2) Whether the Free Port is portion of a larger Port area.

(3) Entries and clearances of Foreign-going shipping during the past ten years (a) in the country to which the Free Ports belongs ; and (b) in the Port of which the Free Port forms a part.

(4) Whether there is any and, if so, what taxation of goods loaded or discharged in the Free Port.

(5) What are the arrangements for the collection of Import and Export Duties on goods passing between the Free Port and the General Customs jurisdiction of the Country.

(6) Nature of inspection under which loading or discharge is carried on in the Free Port.

(7) Classes of Trade (transit or otherwise) for which the Free Port is mainly used." (*Mr. Charles McArthur*) 142

COUNTY COURTS (PLAINTS AND SITTINGS).—Address for " Returns from every County Court in England and Wales of the total number of Plaints, etc., entered in each Court from the 1st day of January to the 31st day of December, 1903, both days inclusive, distinguishing those not exceeding £20, those above £20 and not exceeding £50, and those by agreement over £50." " And of the Sittings of the County Courts in England and Wales holden before the Judges of such Courts in the year 1903 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 271, of Session 1903)."—(*Mr. Cochrane.*) 142

Page

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

ACCIDENT AT WORKS OF MESSRS. JOS. COOK AND SONS—FENCING OF MACHINERY—Question, Mr. Tennant (Berwickshire); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas .. 143

FRENCH GOVERNMENT AND NORTH SEA FISHERIES INVESTIGATION.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Earl Percy 143

PROHIBITION AGAINST MACEDONIANS AND BULGARIANS MOVING TO OTHER PARTS OF EUROPEAN TURKEY.—Question, Mr. Moon (St. Pancras, N.); Answer, Earl Percy 144

NAVAL VOLUNTEERS—INSTRUCTORS AND TRAVELLING EXPENSES.—Question, Mr. Kearley (Devonport); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 144

COMBINED OFFICE OF CHAPLIN AND NAVAL INSTRUCTOR.—Question, Mr. Lyell (Dorsetshire, E.); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 145

COUNTY BOROUGHS WITH POPULATIONS BELOW 50,000.—Question, Sir Edward Sassoon (Hythe); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 145

RAILWAY COMPANIES AND THE NEW SIGNAL ALARM.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 145

RATEABLE VALUE OF POST OFFICE BUILDINGS TO BE ERECTED ON CHRIST'S HOSPITAL SITE.—Question, Sir Joseph Dimsdale (London); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 146

MINTING OF SILVER COINAGE FOR CROWN COLONIES.—Question, Mr. Bayley (Derbyshire, Chesterfield); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 145

RIGHT TO PHOTOGRAPH RAGLAN CASTLE.—Question, Mr. McKenna (Monmouthshire, N.); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 146

BERI-BERI IN THE PORT OF LONDON.—Question, Colonel Legge (St. George's, Hanover Square); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 147

INDIAN CABLE RATE.—Question, Sir Edward Sassoon; Answer, Mr. Brodrick .. 147

PUBLICATION OF LIST OF TITLED PERSONS IN INDIA.—Question, Mr. Schwann (Manchester, N.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 148

DUTIES OF ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY AT BALLINEGORE, COUNTY WESTMEATH.—Question, Mr. Sullivan (Westmeath, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 148

EARNINGS OF THE BURTONPORT RAILWAY.—Question, Mr. M'Fadden (Donegal, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 148

PEACE PRESERVATION ACT IN COUNTY DONEGAL.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty (Donegal, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 149

FAIR RENT APPLICATIONS AND APPEALS IN THE INNISHOWEN DISTRICT.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 149

THROUGH BOOKING OF GOODS ON THE DONEGAL RAILWAY.—Question, Mr. M'Fadden; Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 150

June 30.]

Page

ARREST OF MARTIN NAUGHTEN.—Question, Mr. O'Malley (Galway, Connemara); Answer, Mr. Wynhdam 151

CITY OF LONDON IMPERIAL VOLUNTEERS.—CONDITIONS OF SERVICE IN SOUTH AFRICA.—Question, Sir John Colomb (Great Yarmouth); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 152

PURCHASE OF ARMY COMMISSIONS.—Question, Sir Seymour King (Hull, Central): Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 152

POLICE RAID ON KAFFIR MINE COMPOUNDS AT JOHANNESBURG.—Question, Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 152

COLOURED LABOUR IN TRANSVAAL GOLD MINES.—Question, Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 153

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

CHANNEL FLEET AND THE TYNE.—Question, Mr. Renwick (Newcastle-on-Tyne); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge) 153

DRAFTS FOR INDIA.—Question, Captain Norton (Newington, W.); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, S.) 153

4TH BATTALION NORTH STAFFORDSHIRE MILITIA—ACCIDENT TO PRIVATE HILL.—Question, Mr. Coghill (Stoke-upon-Trent); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 154

SANDHURST EXAMINATION FEES.—Question, Sir Carne Rasch (Essex, Chelmsford); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 155

RE-ARMAMENT OF THE ARTILLERY.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 155

SOUTH AFRICA—ALLEGED CONSPIRACY TO MURDER LORD MILNER.—Question, Mr. Lloyd Morgan (Carmarthenshire, W.); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington) 155

BERI-BERI IN SOUTH AFRICA.—Questions, Dr. Hutchinson (Sussex, Rye) and Mr. Corrie Grant (Warwickshire, Rugby); Answers, Mr. Lyttelton .. 156

TRADING RIGHTS OF BRITISH INDIANS IN THE TRANSVAAL.—Question, Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree (Bethnal Green, N. E.); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 156

SUICIDE OF BRITISH INDIANS IN NATAL.—Question, Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 157

EXPENDITURE OF MALTESE GOVERNMENT—DEPARTMENT OF CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton .. 158

NORTHERN NIGERIA—FINANCE.—Question, Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 159

ADMINISTRATION OF PANNA.—Question, Mr. Schwann (Manchester, N.); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) .. 159

June 30.] *Page*

INDIAN STATISTICAL DEPARTMENT.—Question, Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 160

BRITISH EAST AFRICA.—Question, Mr. Bayley (Derbyshire, Chesterfield); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 161

FOREIGN SAILORS ON BRITISH SHIPS—THE "SOUTHERN CROSS."—Question, Mr. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) 161

LICENSING BILL.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 162

SWINE FEVER REGULATIONS IN ABERDEENSHIRE.—Question, Dr. Farquharson (Aberdeenshire, W.); Answer, Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes (Huntingdonshire, Ramsay) 163

LICENCE FEES IN NORTH OF IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Joseph Devlin; Answer, The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) .. 164

DUBLIN METROPOLITAN POLICE—CONSTABLE WHYTE'S CASE.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 165

IRISH EVICTED TENANTS—CASE OF A. P. DOOLAN OF SHINRONE, KING'S COUNTY.—Questions, Mr. Reddy (King's County, Birr) and Mr. Kilbride (Kildare, S.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 165

BALLINGEARY POLICE FORCE.—Question, Mr. Sheehan (Cork County, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 166

LAND PURCHASE IN COUNTY KERRY—ALLEGED ARBITRARY ACTION OF LANDLORDS.—Questions, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.), Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (Kerry, W.), and Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 166

LISTELLICK FARM.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 169

COLERAINE—ALLEGED POLICE PERSECUTION OF A PUBLICAN.—Questions, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.), and Mr. Thomas O'Donnell; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 169

IRISH VETERINARY DEPARTMENT—CATHOLIC OFFICIALS' SALARY.—Question, Mr. Joseph Devlin; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 170

WICKLOW CAMP CANTEEN LICENCE.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 170

KERRY PARISH COMMITTEES—MANAGEMENT RULES.—Questions, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell and Mr. Flavin Answers, Mr. Wyndham 171

PHŒNIX PARK, DUBLIN.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 172

DEVELOPMENT OF SMALL INDUSTRIES IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. J. F. X. O'Brien (Cork); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 173

June 30.]

Page

ENLARGEMENT OF KILCLOONEY BURIAL GROUND.—Question, Mr. Roche, (Galway, E.) ; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 173

BLAKENEY ESTATE, COUNTY GALWAY.—Question, Mr. Roche ; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 173

CLANRICARDE TENANTS AND SPORTING RIGHTS.—Question, Mr. Roche ; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 174

RAE ESTATE, KEEL, COUNTY KERRY.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell ; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 174

BUNCRANA AND CARDONAGH RAILWAY.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty (Donegal, N.) ; Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.) 175

ENNISKILLEN POST OFFICE—MISSING POSTAL ORDERS.—Question, Mr. Jordan (Fermanagh, S.) ; Answer, The Postmaster-General (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 176

ATTEMPTED PROSELYTISM IN THE CORK POST OFFICE.—Questions, Mr. J. F. X. O'Brien and Mr. John Redmond ; Answers, Lord Stanley 176

BIRTHDAY HONOURS LIST.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.) : Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour. Manchester, E.) 178

IRISH BOARD OF AGRICULTURE—SIR HORACE PLUNKETT'S POSITION.—Questions Mr. Swift MacNeill and Mr. John Redmond ; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour .. 178

THE LICENSING BILL.—Questions. Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) ; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 180

NEW BILL.

VALUATION (NO. 2) BILL.—" To amend the Law to enable the council of every county and county borough to be the sole Valuation Authority of its county or borough for all rateable purposes, and for Income-Tax and Inhabited House Duty " presented by Mr. John Hutton ; supported by Sir John Dorington and Colonel Stopford Sackville ; to be read a second time upon Monday, 18th July, and to be printed. [Bill 249.] 181

Drunkenness (Ireland) Bill.—" To amend the Law relating to Drunkenness in Ireland, and for purposes connected therewith," presented by Mr. Hugh Law ; supported by Sir James Haslett, Sir Thomas Esmonde, Mr. T. W. Russell, and Captain Donelan ; to be read a second time upon Wednesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 250.] 181

SUPPLY [14TH APRIL] [15TH ALLOTTED DAY].—Resolution reported.

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1904–5.—" That a sum, not exceeding £2,839,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge for the Supply and Repair of Warlike and other Stores, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905."

Resolution read a second time.

June 30.] Page

Sir Charles Dilke (*Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean*) 182

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the sum of £2,839,000," and to insert the sum of '£2,829,000.' "—(*Sir Charles Dilke.*)

Question proposed, "That '£2,839,000' stand part of the said Resolution."

The Secretary of State for War (*Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.*) .. 183
Sir John Colomb (*Great Yarmouth*) 186
Sir Howard Vincent (*Sheffield, Central*) 187
Colonel Legge (*St. George's, Hanover Square*) 187
Mr. J. F. Hope (*Sheffield, Brightside*) 188
The Financial Secretary to the War Office (*Mr. Bromley Davenport, Cheshire, Macclesfield*) 188

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 213; Noes, 151. (Division List No. 185.)

Colonel Legge (*St. George's, Hanover Square*) 193
Mr. Courtenay Warner (*Staffordshire, Lichfield*) 195
Sir John Colomb (*Great Yarmouth*) 196
Captain Norton (*Newington, W.*) 196
Mr. Hunt (*Shropshire, Ludlow*) 199
Major Seely (*Isle of Wight*) 200
Sir A. Hayter (*Walsall*) 203
Colonel Nolan (*Galway, N.*) 203
Colonel Blundell (*Lancashire, Ince*) 204
Mr. Bromley Davenport 204
Colonel Bowles (*Middlesex, Enfield*) 207
Sir Carne Rasch (*Essex, Chelmsford*) 208

Resolution agreed to.

SUPPLY [12TH APRIL].—Resolutions reported.

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1904–5.

1. "That a sum, not exceeding £3,646,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expense of Naval Armaments, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905."

2. Sec. 1. "That a sum, not exceeding £3,044,200, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expenses of the Personnel for Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, etc., including the cost of Establishments of Dockyards and Naval Yards at Home and Abroad, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905."

3. Sec. 2. "That a sum, not exceeding £5,062,800, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expense of the Matériel for Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, &c., including the cost of Establishments of Dockyards and Naval Yards at Home and Abroad, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905."

4. "That a sum, not exceeding £2,428,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expense of Victualling and Clothing for the Navy, including the cost of Victualling Establishments at Home and Abroad, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905."

5. "That a sum, not exceeding £293,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expense of Medical Services, including the cost of Medical Establishments at Home and Abroad, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905."

6. "That a sum, not exceeding £15,500, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expense of Martial Law, including the cost of Naval Prisons at Home and Abroad, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905."

7. "That a sum, not exceeding £72,600, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expenses of Scientific Services, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905."

8. "That a sum, not exceeding £404,500, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expenses of the Royal Naval Reserve, the Royal Fleet Reserve, (including Seamen Pensioner Reserve), and the Royal Naval Volunteers, &c., which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905."

9. "That a sum, not exceeding £444,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expense of various Miscellaneous Effective Services, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905."

10. "That a sum, not exceeding £796,200, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expenses of Half Pay, Reserved, and Retired Pay, to Officers of the Navy and Marines, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905."

11. "That a sum, not exceeding £353,300, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expense of Civil Pensions and Gratuities, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905."
Resolutions read a second time.

First Resolution.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee) 211

Motion made, and Question, "That the debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Edmund Robertson*)—put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed upon Monday next.

Second Resolution.

Mr. Edmund Robertson 211
Mr. Kearley (Devonport) 215
The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 217

June 30.]

Page
Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.) 217
Sir Charles Dilke 218
Mr. Pretyman 219

Resolution agreed to,

Third Resolution.

Mr. Edmund Robertson 220
Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) 221
Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis) 222
Mr. Pretyman (Suffolk, Woodbridge) 225
Mr. Buchanan, (Perthshire, E.) 226

Third Resolution agreed to.

Further Consideration of subsequent Resolutions deferred till Monday next.

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENT ESTIMATES, 1904–5.

CLASS I.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £35,500, be granted to Mis Hajesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on 31st day of March, 1905, for Expenditure in respect of Royal Palaces."

Mr. Whitley (Halifax) 228

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £30,500, be granted for the said service."—(*Mr. Whitley*).

Mr. Gibson Bowles 228
Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.) 229
Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley) 229
Mr. John Burns (Battersea) 230

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £69,100, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens."

Page
Mr. Gibson Bowles .. 232
Mr. Labouchere (Northampton) .. 233
Mr. Tennant (Berwickshire) .. 234

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Resolution to be reported upon Monday next; Committee also report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

TYNESIDE TRAMWAYS AND TRAMROADS BILL [LORDS] (BY ORDER).—Order for Consideration, as amended, read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill, as amended, be now considered."

Sir James Woodhouse (Huddersfield) .. 234
Sir Walter Plummer (Newcastle-on-Tyne) .. 238

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out all the words after the word 'Bill,' and add the words 'be re-committed to the former Committee in respect of Clauses 15 and 16.'"—(*Sir James Woodhouse.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Sir Edward Strachey (Somersetshire, E.) .. 240
Mr. Hugh Smith (Northumberland, Tyneside) .. 244
Mr. Benn (Devonport) .. 245
The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade (Mr. Bonar Law, Glasgow, Blackfriars) .. 247
Mr. Runciman (Dewsbury) .. 251
Mr. William Rutherford (Liverpool, West Derby) .. 252
Mr. Henderson (Durham, Barnard Castle) .. 255
Sir Robert Hermon-Hodge (Oxfordshire, Henley) .. 257
Mr. J. A. Pease (Essex, Saffron Walden) .. 257
Mr. Corrie Grant (Warwickshire, Rugby) .. 258

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 142; Noes, 178. (Division List No. 186.)

Words added—

Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; Bill re-committed to the former Committee in respect of Clauses 15 and 16.

SUPPLY [15TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

July 1.] *Page*

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1904–5.

CLASS I.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £69,100, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens."

Mr. Scott-Montague (Hampshire, New Forest) 263

And, it being Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

Adjourned at two minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: FRIDAY, 1st JULY, 1904.

LORD HENNIKER.—Petition of Charles Henry Chandos Henniker-Major, Baron Henniker in the Peerage of Ireland, claiming a right to vote at the election of Representative Peers for Ireland; read, and referred to the Lord Chancellor to consider and report thereupon to the House 265

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power Bill [H.L.].—Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to 265

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [H.L.].—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments (costs awarded), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next 265

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill [H.L.].—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next 265

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [H.L.].—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next 265

Doncaster Corporation Bill.—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 265

Soothill Nether Urban District Tramways Bill.—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 265

De Trafford Estate Bill. [H.L.].—Read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons 265

Great Central Railway Bill; Plymouth Corporation Bill. Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 265

July 1.] *Page*

Matlock and District Gas Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 265

Great Northern Railway Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 266

London County Council (General Powers) Bill.—Brought from the Commons, read 1ª, and referred to the Examiners 266

Skipton Water and Improvement Bill.—Reported, with Amendments .. 266

Hamilton Gas Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.] Read 2ª (according to order) 266

Govan Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Caledonian Railway Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Glasgow and South Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons. 266

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]. Committee of the Whole House (which stands appointed for this day), put off to Tuesday next 266

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [H.L].—Commons Amendments considered (according to order), and agreed to 266

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

WHALING AND WHALE CURING (SCOTLAND).—Report of a Departmental Committee appointed by the Secretary for Scotland to inquire into the new whaling and whale-curing industry on the coast of Scotland and in the adjacent waters. Vol. I. Report. Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 266

POST OFFICE (SAVINGS BANK REGULATIONS).—Regulations affecting the transaction of savings bank business at the British Post Office at Constantinople and at Smyrna. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table. 266

Light Railways Bill [H.L.].—Order for the Third Reading on Monday next, discharged 266

NAUTICAL CHARITIES.

Lord Muskerry 267
Lord Wolverton 268

THE ROYAL DECLARATION AGAINST TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

The Duke of Norfolk 268

Moved to resolve, "That whereas, under the Bill of Rights and the Act of Settlement, the Sovereign is required to join in the Communion with the Church of England as by law established, and ample securities are provided to ensure the Protestant Succession to the Crown; and whereas in addition to these securities, the Sovereign is required, immediately after his Accession, to make a Declaration, commonly called the Declara- against Transubstantiation, which is deeply and needlessly offensive

July 1.] **Page**

to many millions of loyal subjects of His Majesty, this House is of opinion that the Declaration aforesaid ought to be amended so as not to include the condemnation or repudiation of specific doctrines which form part of the conscientious beliefs of any of His Majesty's subjects." ——(*The Duke of Norfolk.*)

The Earl of Jersey 275

Amendment moved—

" To leave out the words after the word 'That' and to insert the words 'this House, while desirous that no expression unnecessarily offensive to any of his subjects should be required of the Sovereign on His Accession to the Throne, is of opinion that nothing should be done to weaken the security of the Protestant Succession.' "—(*The Earl of Jersey.*)

The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury 279
Earl Cowper 282
The Marquess of Ripon 284
The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) 289
The Earl of Crewe 293
The Lord Bishop of Bristol 296
Lord Herries 298
The Duke of Norfoldk 299
The Lord Chancellor (*The Earl of Halsbury*) 300

On Question, " That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Motion," resolved in the negative.

Words inserted.

Resolution, as amended, agreed to.

Lord Stanmore 301

Amendment moved—

" To add the following words to the Resolution, 'and that a Select Committee be appointed to consider whether any unnecessarily offensive words may not be expunged from the King's Declaration without incurring such danger.' "—(*Lord Stanmore.*)

Lord Tweedmouth 304
The Duke of Northumberland 306

Moved, The previous Question.—(*The Duke of Northumberland.*)

The Lord Privy Seal (*The Marquess of Salisbury*) 307
The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury 309
The Duke of Norfolk 309
Viscount Halifax 310

On Question, their Lordships divided :—Contents, 36 ; Not-contents, 103.

Page

Chantrey Trust.—The following Lords were named of the Select Committee—

E. Carlisle.	L. Ribblesdale.
E. Lytton.	L. Newton.
E. Crewe.	L. Killanin.
L. Windsor.	

The Committee to meet on Tuesday next, at three o'clock, and to appoint their own Chairman 313

Open Spaces Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 313

Reserve Forces Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 313

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes past Seven o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: FRIDAY, 1st JULY, 1904.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Private Bills [Lords] (Standing Orders not Previously Inquired into Complied With).—Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills. That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz :—Barry Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill [Lords]; Oakengates and Dawley Joint Water Board Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time 313

Provisional Order Bills [Lords] (No Standing Orders Applicable).—Mr Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz. :—Canal Rates and Charges (Regent's Canal) Order Confirmation Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time upon Monday next 314

County of Suffolk Bill (Standing Orders applicable Thereto not Complied with).—Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred pursuant to the Order of the House of the 27th day of June, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have not been complied with viz. :—County of Suffolk Bill.

Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders 315

July 1.]

Page

London and North Western Railway Bill.—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 315

Ticehurst and District Water and Gas Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 315

Clyde Valley Electrical Power Bill [Lords].—As amended, to be considered upon Monday next 315

Minehead Urban District Council Water Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered ; to be read the third time 315

London County Council (General Powers) Bill.—Ordered, That Standing Order 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed 315

Melrose District Water Order Confirmation Bill.—Considered ; to be read the third time upon Monday next 315

Tynemouth Corporation Bill [Lords].—Harrogate Waterworks Tramroad Bill [Lords] ; Ebbw Vale Urban District Water Bill [Lords] ; Derwent Valley Water Board Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments ; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 315

Richard Jaeger's Patent Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table 315

St. Mary Woolnoth Bill [Lords]. —Reported, without Amendment ; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time 315

Education Board Provisional Order (Birmingham) Bill [Lords]. —Reported, without Amendments [Provisional Order confirmed] ; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time upon Monday next .. 315

Pier Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [Lords].—Reported, without Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed] ; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time upon Monday next 315

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Motherwell, for alteration ; to lie upon the Table 316

LICENSING BILL.—Petitions against ; from Aberfeldy ; Accrington ; Ardsley ; Ashton under Lyne ; Badbury: ; Barry Dock ; Bodmin ; Bradford ; Brailes; Broad Town ; Bronynant ; Cawthorne ; Cheadle ; Chesham (eight) ; Colwyn Bay ; Cottingham ; Crowton ; Dalton ; Dunmore ; East Glamorgan ; Edinburgh ; Edlesborough ; Enderby ; Falkirk ; Falmouth ; Glaisdale : Hackney ; Hampton Court ; Harthill ; Higher Walton ; Histon ; Hodson ; Houlsyke ; Hoylake ; Hurnworth on Tees ; Ketley Bank ; Kidderminster ; Lanark ; Lancaster ; Langthorpe ; Littleworth ; Llanivet ; Lonon ; Loxley ; Mapperley Market Rasen ; Marton le Moor ; Melbourne (two) ; Melmerby ; Methwold ; Middle Rasen ; Morecambe (two) ; Motherwell (two) ; Mountsorrel (two) ; Nanstallon ; Newcastle-on-Tyne (two) ; Norton le Clay ; Nottingham ; Penmaenrhos ; Polbrock ; Pontlottyn ; Rainton ; St. Helen's ; Scarborough ;

Page

Selkirk ; Snow Hill ; Stockport ; Stratford ; Swindon ; Swinton ; Tamworth; Terrington St. Clement ; Thorpe ; Tottenham (two) ; Turnchapel ; Upper Stratton ; Walthamstow ; Wanborough ; Warborough ; Westerdale ; West Kirby ; Whitwinch ; Wigan ; and Wroughton ; to lie upon the Table .. 316

LANDS VALUATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Motherwell, in favour ; to lie upon the Table 316

LAND VALUES TAXATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Motherwell in favour; to lie upon the Table 316

LICENSING BILL.—Petitions for alteration ; from Leek ; and Nottingham ; to lie upon the Table.

RAILWAYS (PRIVATE SIDINGS) BILL.—Petition from Motherwell, in favour ; to lie upon the Table 317

SMALL HOLDERS (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Mosherwell, in favour ; to lie upon the Table 317

TUBERCULOSIS (ANIMALS) COMPENSATION BILL.—Petition from Motherwell, against ; to lie upon the Table 317

VALUATION BILL.—Petitions for alteration ; from Crediton ; and Hayfield ; to lie upon the Table 317

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

WHALING AND WHALE-CURING (SCOTLAND).—Copy presented, of Report of a Departmental Committee appointed by the Secretary for Scotland to inquire into the new Whaling and Whale-curing Industry on the Coast of Scotland and the adjacent waters. Vol. I., Report [by Command] ; to lie upon the Table 317

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

DRAFT SCHEME OF CHARITY COMMISSIONERS FOR WHITSTABLE CHARITIES.—Question, Mr. Slack (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) ; Answer, Mr. Griffith Boscawen 317

TRANSFER OF POWERS OF IRISH HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS TO THE COUNTY COUNCILS.—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde (Wexford, N.) ; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 318

DELAY IN THE PUBLICATION OF CONSULAR REPORTS.—Question, Mr. Yoxall Nottingham, W) ; Answer, Earl Percy 318

SCALES FOR WEIGHING LETTERS IN SUB-POST OFFICES.—Question, Mr. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green) ; Answer, Lord Stanley 319

REMUNERATION OF IRISH SUB-POSTMASTERS.—Question, Mr. Cullinan (Tipperary, S.) ; Answer, Lord Stanley 319

CUSTOMS—PROMOTION OF JUNIOR ASSISTANT CLERKS FOR SPECIAL WORK.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay ; Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 319

July 1.]

LICENSING BILL (PROCEDURE.)

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (*Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.*) 320

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the proceedings in Committee and on Report of the Licensing Bill shall be brought to a conclusion in the manner hereinafter mentioned on six allotted days—

" (*a*) The proceedings in Committee on Clause 1 on the first allotted day.

" (*b*) The proceedings in Committee on Clauses 2 and 3 on the second allotted day.

" (*c*) The proceedings in Committee on Clause 4 on the third allotted day.

" (*d*) The proceedings in Committee on the remaining clauses of the Bill, and on any new Government clauses, and on schedules and any new Government schedules, and any other proceedings necessary to bring the Committee stage to a conclusion on the fourth allotted day.

" (*e*) The proceedings on Report on any new clauses and on Amendments to Clauses 1, 2, and 3 of that Bill, be brought to a conclusion on the fifth allotted day ; and

(*f*) The proceedings on Report be concluded on the sixth allotted day.

After this order comes into operation, any day shall be considered an allotted day for the purposes of this Order on which the Licensing Bill is put down as the first Order of the Day :

At 11 p.m. on the said allotted days, or if the day is a Friday at 4.30 p.m., the Chairman or Speaker shall put forthwith the Question or Questions on any Amendment or Motion already proposed from the Chair, and shall next proceed successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments moved by the Government of which notice has been given (but no other Amendments) and on every Question necessary to dispose of the allotted business to be concluded on the allotted day.

In the case of Government Amendments, or of Government new clauses or schedules, he shall put only the Question that the Amendment be made, or that the clause or schedule be added to the Bill, as the case may be.

" At 12 midnight on the day on which the Third Reading of the Bill is put down as first Order, or, if that day is a Friday, at 5.30 p.m., the Speaker shall put forthwith any Question necessary to conclude the proceedings on that stage of the Bill.

" Proceedings to which this Order relates shall not be interrupted (except at an Afternoon Sitting at 7.30 p.m.), under the provisions of any Standing Order relating to Sittings of the House :

" After the passing of this Order, on any day on which any proceedings on the Licensing Bill stand as the first Order of the Day, no dilatory Motion on the Bill, nor under any Standing Order No. 10, nor Motion to postpone a clause, shall be received unless moved by the Minister in charge of the Bill, and the Question on any such Motion shall be put forthwith. Nor shall any opposed Private Business be set down at the Evening Sitting for consideration on any of the allotted days or on the day on which the Third Reading of the Bill is put down as first Order.

"If Progress be reported, the Chairman shall put this Order in force in any subsequent sitting of the Committee."—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

Mr. Asquith (*Fifeshire, E.*) 331

Amendment proposed—

"In line 1, to leave out all the words after the word 'That,' and insert the words 'this House declines to consider a proposal to deprive the House of Commons, without any justification in the previous course of the debate, of all power of reasonable and adequate discussion in respect of a measure which seeks, in the absence of any authority from the country, to make fundamental and much controverted changes in laws vitally affecting the well-being of the people.' "—(*Mr. Asquith*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'the proceedings' stand part of the Question."

Mr. Pike Pease (*Darlington*) 339
Mr. Lambert (*Devonshire, South Molton*) 340
Sir Mark Stewart (*Kirkcudbrightshire*) 342
Sir Charles Dilke (*Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean*) 343
Mr. Henry Hobhouse (*Somersetshire, E.*) 344
Sir John Leng (*Dundee*) 348
Mr. Emmott (*Oldham*) 350
Mr. Disraeli (*Cheshire, Altrincham*) 355
Mr. Lawson Walton (*Leeds, S.*) 357
Sir John Gorst (*Cambridge University*) 361
Mr. Whittaker (*Yorkshire, W.R., Spen Valley*) 365
Col. Saunderson (*Armagh, N.*) 370
Sir Henry Fowler (*Wolverhampton, E.*) 372
Mr. T. W. Russell (*Tyrone, S.*) 379
Mr. Crooks (*Woolwich*) 382
Col. Kenyon-Slaney (*Shropshire, Newport*) 384
Mr. Labouchere (*Northampton*) 386

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the debate be now adjourned." (*Mr. John Morley*)—put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed upon Monday next.

Dean Forest (Re-Committed) Bill.—Considered in Committee, and reported, without Amendment. Read the third time, and passed 388

Post Office Sites Bill—[SECOND READING.]—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the debate be now adjourned." —(*Lord Stanley*)—put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed upon Monday next 388

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question, " That this House do now adjourn—(*Sir A. A. Acland-Hood.*)—put, and agreed to 388

Adjourned accordingly at twenty-seven minutes after Five o'clock, till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS: MONDAY, 4TH JULY, 1904.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with :—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) ; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 4) ; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Provisional Order.

Also the Certificates that no Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bills :—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1) ; Education Board Provisional Order (Cardiff) ; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2).

And also the Certificate that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have not been complied with :—Saddleworth and Springhead Tramways.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table 389

Charing Cross, Euston, and Hampstead Railway Bill.—The King's consent signified ; and Bill reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 389

Matlock and District Gas Bill [H.L.].—Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to 389

Ilford Urban District Council Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª ; Amendments made ; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons 389

London County Council (Money) Bill.—Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 389

Dean Forest Bill ; Rotherham Corporation Bill. Brought from the Commons ; read 1ª ; and referred to the Examiners 389

Ticehurst and District Water and Gas Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

July 4.] *Page*

London and North Western Railway Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 389

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill; London and India Docks Company Bill; Swindon Corporation Bill; Middlesbrough, Stockton-on-Tees, and Thornaby Tramways Bill; Carlisle Corporation Bill; Clyde Navigation (Works) Bill; Report from the Committee of Selection. That the Lord Braye be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Earl of Mayo; read, and agreed to 390

Buxton Urban District Council Bill [H.L.].—The King's consent signified; and Bill reported, with Amendments 390

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow 390

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [H.L.]—(Walton-on-Thames Order).—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow 390

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [H.L.]—(Kingswood Order opposed).—Report from the Select Committee, Thatthe Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, no parties having appeared in opposition to the said Order; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The orders made on the 17th and 21st of June discharged, the Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow 390

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill [H.L.].—House in Committee (according to order). The Amendments proposed by the Select Committee made; further Amendments made. Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow 390

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [H.L.].—House in Committee (according to order). The Amendments proposed by the Select Committee made; a further Amendment made; Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow 390

PETITIONS.

SUPPLY OF ELECTRICITY BILL [H.L.].—Petitions to be heard by Counsel against; of Corporation of Tynemouth; Corporation of Islington; and Metropoli an Electric Supply Company. Read, and ordered to lie on the Table 391

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

CAPE OF GOOD HOPE (OBSERVATORY).—Report of His Majesty's Astronomer at the Cape of Good Hope to the Secretary of the Admiralty, for the year 1903 .. 391

TRADE REPORT (ANNUAL SERIES).—No. 3201. France (Nice). 391

TRANSVAAL AND ORANGE RIVER COLONY.—Correspondence relating to affairs in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony 391

SOUTH AFRICA.—Census returns of British South Africa 391

July 4.]

Page

Factory and Workshop.—Annual Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories and Workshops for the year 1903. Part I. Reports 391

Education (Scotland) Bill.—Return showing the population, valuation, the average assessment levied under the Education (Scotland) Act, 1872, for the three years 1900–1901 to 1902–1903 in each parish, and the total raised from each local government district, together with calculations showing the amount which would be raised from each parish if the total assessment so raised from each local government district were imposed as a district rate upon parishes on the basis of (1) Valuation alone; and (2) Half on valuation and half on population 391

Labour Statistics (St. Louis Exhibition).—Charts (reduced in size) illustrating the statistics of trade, employment, and conditions of labour in the United Kingdom, prepared for St. Louis Exhibition by the Commercial, Labour, and Statistical Department of the Board of Trade.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 391

Intermediate Education (Ireland).—Rules made by the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland (1) determining the number of centre superintendents to be appointed for the examinations for 1904; (2) appointing the places at which the examinations for 1904 shall be held 392

Public Works Loan Board.—Twenty-ninth Annual Report of the Public Works Loan Board, 1903–1904; with appendices.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act) and ordered to lie on the Table 392

Standing Committee.—Report from the Committee of Selection for the Standing Committee, That they have added the Viscount Sidmouth to the Standing Committee; read, and ordered to lie on the table.. 392

Leith Corporation Tramways Order Confirmation Bill.—Message from the Commons that they have ordered the Committee appointed by them to join with the Committee of this House to consider the said Bill do meet the Lords Committee in Committee Room B on Tuesday next, at Twelve o'clock, as proposed by their Lordships.. 392

Education (Transferred Schools) Bill [H.L.] [Second Reading.]—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

The Lord Bishop of St. Asaph 393

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Lord Bishop of St. Asaph.*)

The Lord President of the Council and President of the Board of Education (The Marquess of Londonderry) 399
Lord Tweedmouth 405
The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury 410
Lord Stanley of Alderley 415
Lord Norton 424
The Lord Bishop of Rochester 426

Page

Lord Ribblesdale 428
The Lord Bishop of Hereford 431
The First Lord of the Admiralty (*The Earl of Selborne*) 432

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes past Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: MONDAY, 4TH JULY, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—Bridlington Corporation Bill [Lords]; Bristol Tramways (Extensions) Bill [Lords]; Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time 437

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz.:—Lord Tredegar's Supplemental Estate Bill [Lords]; Scarisbrick Estate (Amendment) Bill [Lords].

Ordered. That the Bills be read a second time 438

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.:—Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time To-morrow 438

Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill; Brymbo Water Bill; Great Central and Midland Joint Railways Bill; Humber Commercial Railway and Dock Bill; Southend-on-Sea Gas Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 438

Mersey Docks and Harbour Board Bill [LORDS]. As amended, to be considered To-morrow 438

July 4.] Page

Rotherham Corporation Bill.—As amended, considered. Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill according read the third time, and passed 438

Southport and Lytham Tramroad (Extension of Time) Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 439

Clyde Valley Electrical Power Bill [Lords] (by Order).—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 439

Selby Urban District Council Bill (by Order). As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time 439

Melrose District Water Order Confirmation Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 439

Education Board Provisional Order (Birmingham) Bill [Lords]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment 439

Canal Rates and Charges (Regent's Canal) Order Confirmation Bill [Lords].—Read a second time, and committed 439

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill.—Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table .. 439

Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow, and to be printed. Bill [251.] 439

Private Bills (Group L).—Ordered, That Henry Francis Berry, Thomas-Messer Sturgess, and Robert Pittills Dawson do attend the Committee on Group L of Private Bills To-morrow, at half-past Eleven of the clock 439

Private Bills (Group L).—Ordered, That Thomas Carr, James Tait, and Alexander M'Bay do attend the Committee on Group L of Private Bills To-morrow, at half-past Eleven of the clock 440

Message from the Lords.—That they have agreed to—Motherwell and Bellshill Railway (Abandonment) Order Confirmation Bill; North British Railway (General Powers) Order Confirmation Bill; Paisley District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill; without Amendment.

That they have agreed to—Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill; Crystal Palace District Gas Bill, with an Amendment.

Wolverhampton Corporation Bill; Great Central Railway Bill; Plymouth Corporation Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to—Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power Bill [Lords]; Preston Corporation Water Bill [Lords]; Shipley Urban District Council Bill [Lords]; Leicestershire and Warwickshire Electric Power Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

July 4.] *Page*

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, " An Act to consolidate enactments relating to Open Spaces." [Open Spaces Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill, intituled, " An Act to amendthe Law relating to the Reserve Forces." [Reserve Forces Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill, intituled, " An Act to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Scotch Education Department, under the Education (Scotland) Act, 1878, to enable the School Board of the Burgh of Edinburgh to put in force the Lands Clauses Acts." [Scotch Education Department Provisional Order Confirmation (Edinburgh) Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill, intituled, " An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade, under the Tramways Act, 1870, relating to Bishop Auckland, Shildon, and Spennymoor Tramways, Dewsbury Corporation Tramways, East Ham Urban District Council Tramways, Ossett Corporation Tramways, Sunderland Corporation Tramway, and West Ham Corporation Tramways." [Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords].]

Also, a Bill, intituled, " An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Wishaw Corporation." [Wishaw Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill, intituled, " An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Airdrie Corporation Gas," [Airdrie Corporation Gas Order Confirmation Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill, intituled, " An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to the Burgh of Govan." Govan Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill, intituled, " An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to the Caledonian Railway." [Caledonian Railway Order Confirmation Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled " An Act to confirm a Provisional Order, under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to the Glasgow and South Western Railway." [Glasgow and South Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to enlarge the powers of Investment of the Trustees of Sir Humphrey Francis de Trafford's Settled Estates so as to enable them to purchase his life Interest in the Settled Estates, and for vesting Life interest in such Trustees ; and for other purposes." [De Trafford Estate Bill [Lords.]

And, also, a Bill, intituled, " An Act to authorise the Urban District Council of Ilford, in the county of Essex, to carry out street improvements ; to make further provision for the improvement, health, local Government, and finance of the district ; and for other purposes." [Ilford Urban District Council Bill [Lords.] 440

Scotch Education Department Provisional Order Confirmation (Edinburgh) Bill [Lords].—Read the first time ; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 252] 442

July 4.]

Page

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No.2) Bill [Lords].—Read the first time referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 253.] 442

Wishaw Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [Lords].—To be considered upon Wednesday 442

Airdrie Corporation Gas Order Confirmation Bill [Lords].—To be considered upon Wednesday 442

Govan Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 12th July, and to be printed. [Bill 254] 442

Caledonian Railway Order Confirmation Bill [Lords].—Read the first time ; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 12th July, and to be printed. [Bill 255.] 442

Glasgow and South Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill [Lords.] —Read the first time ; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 12th July, and to be printed. [Bill 256] 442

De Trafford Estate Bill [Lords].—Ilford Urban District Council Bill [Lords]. Read the first time ; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 442

PETITIONS.

Licensing Bill.—Petitions against ; from Acaster Malbis ; Addlestone ; Alnmouth ; Althorpe ; Ashbourne ; Ashton under Lyne ; Ashwater ; Aughton ; Aylsham ; Barnsley ; Bassalleg ; Bawdeswell ; Belton ; Bishop Auckland ; Bishop Monkton ; Bishop's Nympton ; Blackfordby ; Boroughbridge ; Borth; Briston ; Bromley ; Carlisle ; Castleton (two) ; Chertsey ; Church Gresley ; Colby ; Corringham ; Cromer ; Denbigh Head ; Dogmaels ; Drinkstone ; East Dulwich ; Edmonton ; Enfield ; Forest Hill ; Glaisdale End ; Grafton cum Marton ; Gregilt ; Gunthorpe ; Gunwalloe ; Hampsthwaite ; Hartlepool (two) ; Hartshorne ; Haverfordwest ; Haxey ; Hickling ; Higham Ferrers ; Hull (two) ; Killinghall ; Kingston upon Hull ; Leicester ; Levenshulme ; Llangwn ; Loughton ; Luddington ; Lytham (two) ; Manor Park ; Marloes ; Masbro' ; Merlin's Bridge ; Merthyr ; Milford Haven ; Minkskip ; Staveley, and Aldborough ; Mundesley ; Newton Longville ; North Walsham ; Norwich ; Norwich, North Walsham, and Cromer (five) ; Overstand ; Owston ; Plymouth ; Ponsanooth ; Reepham ; Rhondda Fawr ; Ripon (two) ; Roch ; Rochdale ; Salhouse ; Seven Kings ; Sheffield ; South Repps ; South Wales ; Swallow Nest ; Swadlincote ; Swanton ; Tostoch ; Tottenham ; Treeton ; Walton on Thames ; Whitland ;Willesden Green ; Wishaw ; Wolverhampton (two) ; Wombourne ; Woodville ; and Wroot ; to lie upon the Table .. 443

Valuation Bill.—Petition from Glendale, for alteration ; to lie upon the Table 443

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Factories and Workshops.—Copy presented, of Report of the Chief Inspector for 1903, Part I., Reports [by Command] ; to lie upon the Table 443

South Africa.—Copy presented, of Census Returns of British South Africa [by Command] ; to lie upon the Table 443

July 4.]

Page

TRANSVAAL AND ORANGE RIVER COLONY.—Copy presented, of Correspondence relating to Affairs in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony by Command]; to lie upon the Table 444

Education [Scotland] Bill.—Copy presented, of Return showing the population, valuation, the average assessment levied under The Education (Scotland) Act, 1872, for the three years 1900–1901 to 1902–3 in each parish, and the total raised from each local government district, together with calculations showing the amount which would be raised from each parish if the total assessment so raised from each local government district were imposed as a district rate upon parishes on the basis of (1) valuation alone, and (2) half on valuation and half on population [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 444

PUBLIC WORKS LOAN BOARD.—Copy presented, of Twenty-ninth Annual Report (for 1903–4), with Appendices [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 238] 444

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Rule made by the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland appointing the places at which Examinations shall be held for 1904 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 444

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Rule made by the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland determining the number of Centre Superintendents to be appointed for the Examinations, 1904 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 444

CAPE OF GOOD HOPE OBSERVATORY.—Copy presented, of Report of the Astronomer to the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty for the year 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 444

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 3201 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 444

Electric Light Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill.—Copy ordered, " of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill."—(*Mr. Bonar Law.*) 445

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

POSTAL FACILITIES IN COUNTY KERRY.—Question, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.); Answer, Lord Stanley 445

CARRIAGE OF GOODS FROM TYNAN (COUNTY ARMAGH) TO GLASGOW.—Question, Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 445

STEAMER "ALLANTON" CONFISCATED BY RUSSIANS AT VLADIVOSTOCK.—Question, Colonel Denny (Kilmarnock Burghs); Answer, Earl Percy .. 445

OBSERVANCE OF SUNDAY IN THE ROYAL NAVY.—Question, Sir Mark Stewart (Kirkcudbrightshire); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 446

REFUSAL TO SANCTION LOAN FOR PURCHASE OF LAND FOR ALLOTMENTS AT GOSBERTON.—Question, Sir Walter Foster (Derbyshire, Ilkeston); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 446

July 4.] *Page*

ACCIDENTS WITH COVERED VANS—INFRINGEMENT OF NEW BYE-LAW.—Question, Sir Thomas Dewar (Tower Hamlets, St. George's); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 447

VALUE OF LICENSED PREMISES.—Question, Sir Edward Sassoon (Hythe); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 447

ASSESSMENT OF INCOME TAX ON CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE BRITISH COTTON-GROWING ASSOCIATION.—Question, Mr. Emmott (Oldham); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 448

EPIDEMIC AT BALLYNACLOSHA—NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHER'S SALARY.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (Kerry, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 449

SALES ON THE KING HARMAN (KENAGH) ESTATE.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell, (Longford, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 449

PEAT FACTORY EXPERIMENTS IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 449

GAS FROM PEAT.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 450

CONDITION OF FISHING INDUSTRY ON THE SOUTH-EAST COAST OF IRELAND.—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde (Wexford, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham .. 450

SALARIES OF IRISH SCHOOL TEACHERS.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 450

BURIAL GROUND AT LEIXLIP.—Question, Mr. Leamy (Kildare, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 451

IRISH EVICTED TENANTS—APPLICATIONS OF MR. GEORGE WARD FOR RE-INSTATEMENT.—Question, Mr. Hugh Law (Donegal, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham .. 452

VALUATION OF MR. O'DONNELL'S LANDS AT ANNASCAUL.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 452

COLOURS OF MILITIA REGIMENTS THAT SERVED IN SOUTH AFRICA.—Question, Mr. Emmott; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 453

MALTA GOVERNMENT BALANCE SHEET.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 453

CENSUS OF THE TRANSVAAL.—Question, Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 454

THE TRANSVAAL LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.—Question, Mr. John Ellis; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 454

RESIGNATION OF SIR CHARLES ELLIOT—SUGGESTED COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 455

NATIVE LABOUR IN THE TRANSVAAL MINES.—Question, Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 456

July 4.]

Page

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

FLOGGING IN THE NAVY.—Questions, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.), and Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answers, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge) 457

VOLUNTEERS IN CAMP.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield Central); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, S.) .. 458

CHINESE LABOUR IN THE TRANSVAAL—RECRUITMENT AT CANTON.—Question, Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington) 458

NUMBER OF CHINESE ALREADY IN SOUTH AFRICA.—Questions, Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.) and Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar); Answers, Mr. Lyttelton 459

TREATMENT OF CHINESE COOLIES AT DURBAN.—Questions, Major Seely (Isle of Wight); Answers, Mr. Lyttelton 460

TERMS OF CHINESE LABOUR CONTRACT.—Question, Mr. Labouchere (Northampton); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 461

NO CLOSE TIME FOR CHINESE COOLIES.—Question, Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 462

EMBARKATION OF COOLIES AT HONG KONG.—Question, Mr. Herbert Samuel; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 462

DEBARKATION OF COOLIES FROM THE "TWEEDDALE."—Question, Dr. Macnamara; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 462

NATAL ACT (IMMIGRATION) 1903—ALLEGED INFRACTION BY THE "TWEEDDALE"—Questions, Major Seely; Answers, Mr. Lyttelton 463

BERI-BERI ON THE "TWEEDDALE."—Question, Sir Walter Foster (Derbyshire, Ilkeston); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 464

TELEGRAMS TO LORD MILNER.—Question, Dr. Macnamara; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 464

CHINESE EXCLUSION BILL IN CAPE COLONY.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 465

REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT IN SOUTH AFRICA.—Question, Mr. Lambert; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 465

MALTESE FINANCES.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 466

THE TIBETAN MISSION.—Questions, Mr. Lambert and Mr. Flynn (Cork, Co., N.); Answers, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 466

RUSSO-JAPANESE WAR—SEIZURE OF THE "ALLANTON."—Questions, Mr. Wolff (Belfast, E.), Mr. Joseph Devlin (Kilkenny, N.) and Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.); Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 467

July 4.] Page

International Maritime Conference at Brussels.—Question, Mr. Charles McArthur (Liverpool, Exchange); Answer, Earl Percy 468

Circulation in England of Foreign Lottery Circulars.—Question, Sir Thomas Dewar (Tower Hamlets, St. George's); Answer, Earl Percy .. 468

Protection of British Interests at Niuchwang.—Question, Mr. Joseph Walton (Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley); Answer, Earl Percy 469

Licensing Bill—Value of Licensed Premises Affected.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) .. 469

Amendment of the Workmen's Compensation Act.—Question, Sir Thomas Dewar; Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 470

North-Eastern Railway—Unprotected Live Rails.—Question, Mr. Renwick (Newcastle-on-Tyne); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) 470

Solway Fishery Bill.—Questions, Mr. Claude Lowther (Cumberland, Eskdale) and Mr. Kilbride (Kildare, S.); Answers, Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes (Huntingdonshire, Ramsey) 470

Rathmines Polling District Dispute.—Question, Mr. Mooney (Dublin Co., S.); Answer, The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) 471

Rathmines Commissioners' Appeal.—Questions, Mr. Mooney and Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 471

Irish Land Purchase—Ballydoulon Estate, County Galway.—Question, Mr. Roche (Galway, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 472

Winter Dairying in Ireland.—Questions, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.), Mr. Kilbride, and Captain Donelan (Cork County, E.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham .. 472

Land Purchase in County Cavan—David Finlay's Estate.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy (Cavan, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 473

Tenant's Game Rights—The Clanricarde Tenants at Woodford.—Questions, Mr. Roche, Mr. Kilbride, and Mr. T. W. Russell; Answers, Mr. Wyndham .. 474

Irish Workhouse Classification.—Question, Mr. Reddy (King's County, Birr); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 476

Enniskillen Rent Appeals.—Question, Mr. Edward Mitchell (Fermanagh, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 476

Bawnboy Rent Disputes.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 476

Sir Roger Palmer's Estate, County Mayo.—Question, Mr. Joseph Devlin; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 477

Enniskillen Dispensary Districts.—Question, Mr. Jordan (Fermanagh, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 477

July 4.]

Page

CONGESTION IN SOUTH KERRY.—Questions, Mr. Boland and Mr. Flavin; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 478

PROMOTION OF IRISH NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 479

GOVERNMENT ADVANCES FOR HARBOUR WORKS IN IRELAND.—Questions, Mr. Charles Craig (Antrim, S.) and Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 479

IRISH UNIVERSITY EDUCATION.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 480

LOUGH LEAGH LAND PROPRIETORS MEETING.—Questions, Mr. Joseph Devlin; Answers, Mr. Wyndham and the Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.) 482

COMPLAINTS OF REV. R. D. PATTERSON, OF ST. BARNABAS' CHURCH, DUBLIN.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 482

WEST COAST OF IRELAND—FISH-CURING STATIONS.—Questions, Mr. Sheehan (Cork County, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 483

THE MCGILLYCUDDY ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 483

INSANITARY CONDITION OF DEE STREET, BELFAST.—Question, Mr. Joseph Devlin; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 484

KERRY LETTER DELIVERIES.—Question, Mr. Murphy; Answer, The Postmaster-General (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 484

BELFAST POST-OFFICE—MONEY ORDER COUNTER FUNDS.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Lord Stanley 484

BELFAST MAILS—PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTARY SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Charles Craig; Answer, Lord Stanley 485

LONDON DELIVERY OF BELFAST MAILS—ALLEGED DELAY.—Question, Mr. Charles Craig; Answer, Lord Stanley 486

GREAT SOUTHERN AND WESTERN RAILWAY OF IRELAND—GLONNBAWN LEVEL CROSSING.—Question, Mr. Murphy; Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 486

FRAUDULENT BALANCE SHEETS.—Questions, Mr. T. W. Russell and Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 487

FINANCE BILL.—Question, Mr. John Ellis; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 487

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Questions, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 487

July 4.] *Page*

Licensing Bill (PROCEDURE).—

Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Amendment to Question (1st July], "That the proceedings in Committee and on Report of the Licensing Bill shall be brought to a conclusion in the manner hereinafter mentioned in six allotted days—

(*a*) The proceedings in Committee on Clause 1 on the first allotted day.

(*b*) The proceedings in Committee on Clauses 2 and 3 on the second allotted day.

(*c*) The proceedings in Committee on Clause 4 on the third allotted day.

(*d*) The proceedings in Committee on the remaining clauses of the Bill, and on any new Government clauses, and on schedules and any new Government schedules, and any other proceedings necessary to bring the Committee stage to a conclusion on the fourth allotted day.

(*e*) The proceedings on Report on any new clauses and on Amendments to Clauses 1, 2, and 3 of that Bill, be brought to a conclusion on the fifth allotted day; and

(*f*) The proceedings on Report be concluded on the sixth allotted day.

After this order comes into operation, any day shall be considered an allotted day for the purposes of this Order on which the Licensing Bill is put down as the first Order of the Day.

At 11 p.m. on the said allotted days, or if the day is a Friday at 4.30 p.m., the Chairman or Speaker shall put forthwith the Question or Questions on any Amendment or Motion already proposed from the Chair, and shall next proceed successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments moved by the Government of which notice has been given (but no other Amendments) and on every Question necessary to dispose of the allotted business to be concluded on the allotted day.

In the case of Government Amendments, or of Government new clauses or schedules, he shall put only the Question that the Amendment be made, or that the clause or schedule be added to the Bill, as the case may be.

At twelve midnight of the day on which the Third Reading of the Bill is put down as first order, or, if that day is a Friday, at 5.30 p.m., the Speaker shall put forthwith any Question necessary to conclude the proceedings on that stage of the Bill.

Proceedings to which this Order relates shall not be interrupted (except at an Afternoon Sitting at 7.30 p.m.), under the provisions of any Standing Order relating to Sittings of the House.

After the passing of this Order, on any day on which any proceedings on the Licensing Bill stand as the first Order of the day, no dilatory Motion on the Bill, nor under Standing Order No. 10, nor Motion to postpone a clause, shall be received, unless moved by the Minister in charge of the Bill, and the Question on any such Motion shall be put forthwith. Nor shall any opposed private business be set down at the Evening Sitting for consideration on any of the allotted days, or on the day on which the Third Reading of the Bill is put down as first Order.

If Progress be reported, the Chairman shall put this Order in force in any subsequent sitting of the Committee."—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

Which Amendment was—

"In line 1, to leave out all the words after the word 'That' and insert the words 'this House declines to consider a proposal to deprive the House of Commons, without any justification in the previous course of the debate, of all power of reasonable and adequate discussion in respect of a measure which seeks, in the absence of any authority from the country, to make fundamental and much controverted changes in laws vitally affecting the well-being of the people."—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

Question again proposed, "That the words 'the proceedings' stand part of the Question."

Mr. John Morley (Montrose Burghs) 490
Mr. John Redmond (Waterford) 501
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 507
Mr. Lloyd-George (Carnarvon Boroughs) 520
Mr. Middlemore (Birmingham, N.) 526
Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe) 527
Mr. Tritton (Lambeth, Norwood) 532
Mr. Moulton (Cornwall, Launceston) 535
Sir Carne Rasch (Essex, Chelmsford) 540
Mr. J. H. Lewis (Flint Boroughs) 541
Sir J. Stirling-Maxwell (Glasgow, College) 542
Mr. Samuel Evans (Glamorganshire, Mid) 543
Sir John Kennaway (Devonshire, Honiton) 545
Mr. Barlow (Somersetshire, Frome) 546
Mr. Marshall Hall (Lancashire, Southport) 548
Mr. Helme (Lancashire, Lancaster) 552

And, it being half-past Seven of the Clock, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

Licensing Bill (PROCEDURE).

Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Amendment to Question [1st July], "That the proceedings in Committee and on Report of the Licensing Bill shall be brought to a conclusion in the manner hereinafter mentioned on six allotted days:

(*a*) The proceedings in Committee on Clause 1 on the first allotted day.

(*b*) The proceedings in Committee on Clauses 2 and 3 on the second allotted day.

(*c*) The proceedings in Committee on Clause 4 on the third allotted day.

(*d*) The proceedings in Committee on the remaining clauses of the Bill, and on any new Government clauses, and on schedules, and any new Government schedules, and any other proceedings necessary to bring the Committee stage to a conclusion on the fourth allotted day.

(*e*) The proceedings on Report on any new clauses and on Amendments to Clauses 1, 2, and 3 of that Bill, be brought to a conclusion on the fifth allotted day, and

(*f*) The proceedings on Report be concluded on the sixth allotted day.

After this Order comes into operation, any day shall be considered an allotted day for the purposes of this Order on which the Licensing Bill is put down as the first Order of the Day.

At 11 p.m. on the said allotted days, or if the day is a Friday at 4.30 p.m., the Chairman or Speaker shall put forthwith the Question or Questions on any Amendment or Motion already proposed from the Chair, and shall next proceed successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments moved by the Government of which notice has been given (but no other Amendments) and on every Question necessary to dispose of the allotted business to be concluded on the allotted day.

In the case of Government Amendments or of Government new clauses or schedules, he shall put only the Question that the Amendment be made, or that the clause or schedule be added to the Bill, as the case may be.

At 12 midnight on the day on which the Third Reading of the Bill is put down as first Order, or, if that day is a Friday, at 5.30 p.m., the Speaker shall put forthwith any Question necessary to conclude the proceedings on that stage of the Bill.

Proceeding to which this Order relates shall not be interrupted (except at an Afternoon Sitting at 7.30 p.m.) under the provisions of any Standing Order relating to Sittings of the House.

After the passing of this Order, on any day on which any proceedings on the Licensing Bill stand as the first Order of the Day, no dilatory Motion on the Bill, nor under Standing Order No. 10, nor Motion to postpone a clause, shall be received unless moved by the Minister in charge of the Bill, and the Question on any such Motion shall be put forthwith. Nor shall any opposed Private Business be set down at the Evening Sitting for consideration on any of the allotted days or on the day on which the Third Reading of the Bill is put down as first Order.

If progress be reported, the Chairman shall put this Order in force in any subsequent sitting of the Committee."—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

Which Amendment was—

"In line 1, to leave out all the words after the word 'That' and insert the words 'this House declines to consider a proposal to deprive

the House of Commons, without any justification in the previous course of the debate, of all power of reasonable and adequate discussion in respect of a measure which seeks, in the absence of any authority from the country, to make fundamental and much controverted changes in laws vitally affecting the well-being of the people."—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

Question again proposed, "That the words 'the proceedings' stand part of the Question."

Mr. Helme 555
Mr. Spear (*Devonshire, Tavistock*) 556
Mr. Atherley-Jones (*Durham, N.W.*) 557
Colonel Lockwood (*Essex, Epping*) 558
Mr. Bryce (*Aberdeen, S.*) 559
Mr. J. Chamberlain (*Birmingham, W.*) 563
Dr. Macnamara (*Camberwell, N.*) 570
Mr. Bousfield (*Hackney, N.*) 572
Mr. Winston Churchill (*Oldham*) 573
Mr. Cathcart Wason (*Orkney and Shetland*) 580
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (*Stirling Burghs*) 582

And, it being midnight, Mr. SPEAKER proceeded to interrupt the business.

Whereupon Mr. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided: Ayes, 303; Noes, 223. (Division List No. 187.)

Question put accordingly, "That the words 'the proceedings' stand part of the Question."

The House divided; Ayes, 301; Noes, 228. (Division List No. 188.)

Main Question again proposed.

And, it being after Midnight, and objection being taken to further Proceeding, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed to-morrow.

Adjourned at twenty-three minutes before One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: TUESDAY, 5TH JULY, 1904.

LORD HENNIKER.—Report made from the Lord Chancellor that the right of Charles Henry Chandos Henniker-Major, Baron Henniker in the Peerage of Ireland, to vote at the election of Representative Peers for Ireland has been established to the satisfaction of the Lord Chancellor; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 601

July 5.] *Page*

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have not been complied with :—London County Council (General Powers).

The same was ordered to lie on the Table 601

Leyton Urban District Council Bill.—Report from His Majesty's Attorney-General received, and ordered to lie on the Table 601

Thurles Urban District Council Water Bill.—Reported with Amendments 601

London United Tramways Bill.—Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, no parties having appeared in opposition thereto ; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The orders made on the 16th and 21st of June last discharged, and Bill committed for Thursday next 601

Tramway Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.].—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next. 601

Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, no parties having appeared in opposition thereto ; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The orders made on the 14th and 21st of June last discharged, and Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next 601

Leith Corporation Tramway Orders Confirmation Bill.—Report from the Joint Committee that the Bill ought to be allowed to proceed ; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 602

Melrose District Water Order Confirmation Bill.—Brought from the Commons 602

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (Birmingham) Bill [H.L.] ; Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to 602

Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill ; Brymbo Water Bill ; Great Central and Midland Joint Railways Bill ; Humber Commercial Railway and Dock Bill ; Southend-on-Sea Gas Bill. Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 602

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. -House in Committee (according to order). The Amendments proosped by the Select Committee made. Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received on Thursday next 602

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [H.L.].—House in Committee (according to order). The Amendments proposed by the Select Committee made ; further Amendments made. Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received on Thursday next .. 602

July 5.] *Page*

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [H.L.].—Amendments reported (according to order), and Bills to be read 3ª on Thursday next 602

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.].—House in Committee (according to order). Amendments made. Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received on Thursday next 602

Melrose District Water Order Confirmation Bill. Read 1ª; to be printed; and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899), deemed to have been read 2ª (The Lord Kintore (*E. Kintore*)), and reported from the Committee. (No. 130.) 602

PETITION.

SUPPLY OF ELECTRICITY BILL [H.L.].—Petition to be heard by Counsel for Amendment of ; of Electric Supply Companies; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 602

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3202. United States (Chicago); No. 3203. Venezuela (Caracas).

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 603

Dean Forest Bill.—Order of yesterday referring the Bill to the Examiners discharged; and Bill to be printed. (No. 131.) 603

Re-Vaccination Bill [H.L.].—Reported from the Standing Committee without further Amendment. The Report of the Amendment made in the Committee of the Whole House to be received on Thursday next .. 603

Railways (Private Sidings) Bill.—[SECOND READING.]—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Wolverton 603

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Wolverton.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House, on Friday next.

Hall-Marking of Foreign Plate Bill.—[SECOND READING.]—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

The Earl of Lytton 604

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Lytton.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Friday next.

July 5.] Page

YEOMANRY WEAPONS.—

Lord Ashburton 606
Lord Willoughby de Broke 608
The Earl of Lonsdale 610
The Under Secretary of State for War (The Earl of Donoughmore) .. 611
Lord Tweedmouth 612
Earl Roberts 614

THE CHINESE IN THE TRANSVAAL.

Lord Coleridge 616
The Under Secretary of State for the Colonies (The Duke of Marlborough) 617

House adjourned at twenty minutes past Five o'clock, to Thursday next, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: TUESDAY, 5TH JULY, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz. :—Belfast Corporation (Tramways) Bill [Lords]; Manchester Corporation (General Powers) Bill [Lords]. Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time 618

Minehead Urban District Council Water Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 618

St. Mary Woolnoth Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment 618

Filey Improvement Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 618

Maidenhead Bridge Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered; an Amendment made; Bill to be read the third time 618

Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill.—Lords Amendment considered, and agreed to 618

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill—Consideration, as amended, deferred till Friday 618

Glasgow Corporation (Police) Order Confirmation Bill.—Read a second time; to be considered upon Thursday 618

July 5.] *Page*

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [LORDS].—Read a second time, and committed 618

STANDING ORDERS.—Resolution reported from the Select Committee; "That, in the case of the County of Suffolk Bill, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with:—That the Bill be permitted to proceed, provided that the consent of the holders of securities given by the Joint Committee of the Counties of East and West Suffolk be proved before the Committee on the Bill and that the notices for the Bill be published in the *London Gazette* and in the local newspapers 618

Resolution agreed to.

Loch Leven Water Power Bill—Reported with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 619

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill.—Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered upon Friday, and to be printed. [Bill 258.] 619

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP L).—Mr. AGG-GARDNER reported from the Committee on Group L of Private Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Thursday, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table 619

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have agreed to—London County Council (Money) Bill, with Amendments

Amendments to—Matlock and District Gas Bill [Lords]; Ticehurst and District Water and Gas Bill [Lords], without Amendment 619

Leith Corporation Tramways Order Confirmation Bill Reported from the Joint Committee, without Amendment [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Minutes of Proceedings to be printed. [No. 240.]

Bill to be read the third time upon Thursday 619

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.—Petitions against; from Aberdeen; Aldcliffe; Alston; Barnsley; Barnstaple; Beaminster; Bethnal Green (two); Blackburn; Bournbrook; Bradford; Brentwood; Bridport; Briercliffe; Broome; Burgh St. Peter; Carlisle (fourteen); Cheadle; Clifton; Colne; Cripplegate; Crook; Dewsbury; Dilhorne; Gillingham; Hackney (three); Halling; Halstead; Hardley; Hetton-le-Hole; Hitchin; Hornsey; Hoxton; Huby; Hucknall; Huggate; Hugglescote; Ipstones; Ipswich; Kidderminster; Kirby Cane; Kiveton Park; Lambton Park; Leigh on Mendip; Leven; Lewes; Lidlington; Lodge Lane; London; Lye; Manchester; Morecambe; Moreton Morrell; Motherwell; Mount Gretna; Nelson (eight); Newcastle-on-Tyne; Newport; New Row; North Hill; North Walsham; Nottingham (two);

July 5.] *Page*

Nuneaton; Oldham; Padiham (two); Pendleton; Pitsmoor; Potton; Puncknowle; Richmond; Sheerness; Sheffield; Sneinton; Stamford Hill; Stantonbury; Ston Easton; Stratford on Avon; Stromness; Sunderland; Tannochside; Tean; Toxteth; Trowbridge (two); Upper Clapton; Uppermill; Upper Tooting; Wellesbourne; Whalley; Widcombe; Wiltshire; Winnothdale; Woodburn; and Woollfold; to lie upon the Table 619

LICENSING BILL.—Petitions for alteration; from Chichester; and Lynn Regis; to lie upon the Table 620

SALE OF BUTTER BILL.—Petition from Dumfries, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 620

SALE OF WHISKEY BILL.—Petition from Dumfries, in favour; to lie upon the Table 620

TUBERCULOSIS (ANIMALS) COMPENSATION BILL.—Petition from the Royal, Parliamentary, and Police Burghs of Scotland, against; to lie upon the Table 620

TEINDS (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Dumfries, in favour; to lie upon the Table 620

VALUATION BILL.—Petitions for alteration; from Chertsey; Dudley; Hoo; Lancaster; and Newhaven; to lie upon the Table 621

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

ST. LOUIS EXHIBITION (STATISTICAL TABLES).—Copy presented, of charts (reduced in size) illustrating the Statistics of Trade, Employment, and Conditions of Labour in the United Kingdom prepared for the St. Louis Exhibition by the Commercial, Labour, and Statistical Department of the Board of Trade [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 621

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 4th July; *Mr. Bonar Law*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 239.] 621

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

ADMIRALTY SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMME—BALANCE OF ORDERS.—Question, Mr. J. F. Hope (Sheffield, Brightside); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 621

PENSION OF WILLIAM WELSFORD, DEVONPORT SHIPWRIGHT.—Question, Mr. Kearley (Devonport); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 621

CHAIRMAN OF AN URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL—POWERS OF VOTING.—Question, Mr. Parrott (Yorkshire, W.R., Normanton); Answer, Mr. Walter Long .. 622

PURCHASE OF ESTATES IN SLIGO BY THE CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD.—Question, Mr. O'Dowd (Sligo, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 623

COST OF COLLECTION OF TAXES IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 624

ISSUE OF SOUTH AFRICAN CLASPS TO YEOMANRY.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Mr. Bromley Davenport .. 624

July 5.] *Page*

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION IN NON-PROVIDED SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. H. C. Richards (Finsbury, E.); Answer, Sir William Anson 625

FEES OF MEDICAL MEN CALLED IN BY THE POLICE.—Question, Dr. Ambrose (Mayo, W.); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 625

BUNKER CAPACITY OF "SCOUT" CLASS OF BOAT—MAINTENANCE OF SPEED.—Question, Sir John Colomb (Great Yarmouth); Answer, Mr. Pretyman .. 626

CUSTOMS DUTY ON TOBACCO STRIPS.—Question, Mr. Charles M'Arthur (Liverpool, Exchange); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 626

INCOME OF TEACHER OF BALLYNACLOSHA NATIONAL SCHOOL.—Question, Mr. P. A. M'Hugh (Leitrim, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 630

CONTRIBUTIONS BY IRISH NATIONAL TEACHERS TO UPKEEP OF SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. P. A. M'Hugh; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 630

BURTONPORT RAILWAY AGREEMENT.—Question, Mr. M'Fadden (Donegal, E.); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 630

BALLINASCARTHY AND TIMOLEAGUE LIGHT RAILWAY.—Question, Mr. M'Fadden; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 631

LONGFORD DRAINAGE.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell (Longford, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 631

DEPORTATION TO LONGFORD OF ENGLISH AND SCOTCH PAUPERS.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 632

MONEY FOR DONEGAL UNDER THE MARINE WORKS ACT.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty (Donegal, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 632

CONSTRUCTION OF SEA WALL AND BOAT SLIP AT PORTASANTAL, COUNTY DONEGAL—Question, Mr. O'Doherty; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 633

EXPENDITURE FROM ARMY VOTES ON BRENNAN TORPEDO ESTABLISHMENTS.—Question, Sir John Colomb; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 633

TERMS OF RETIREMENT OF PAYMASTERS OF ARMY PAY DEPARTMENT.—Question, Mr. Moon (St. Pancras, N.); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 634

SALE OF GOVERNMENT STORES BY COLONEL MORGAN IN SOUTH AFRICA.—Question, Mr. Charles Hobhouse (Bristol, E.); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 634

COST OF REPORT OF ARMY MEDICAL DEPARTMENT—DELAY IN PUBLICATION.—Question, Mr. Charles Hobhouse; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 634

RESOLUTION OF INTER-COLONIAL COUNCIL AS TO RAILWAY ADMINISTRATION IN SOUTH AFRICA.—Question, Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 635

July 5.] *Page*

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

FLOGGING IN THE NAVY.—Questions, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.) and Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answers, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge) 635

CANING STATISTICS IN THE NAVY.—Questions, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, Mr. Pretyman 636

CHATHAM MILITARY RAILWAY.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Mr. Bromley Davenport, Cheshire, Macclesfield) 636

BITTERNE REMOUNT DEPOT.—Question, Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton); Answer, Mr. Bromley Davenport 638

TRANSVAAL EXPLOSIVES TAX.—Questions, Mr. Whiteley (Halifax) and Mr. Markham (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield); Answers, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. J. Chamberlain, Birmingham, W.) 638

TRANSVAAL LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.—Questions, Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.) and Mr. Lambert; Answers, Mr. Lyttelton 639

TRANSVAAL FINANCE.—Question, Mr. Buchanan; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton .. 639

BRITISH CONSULAR REPRESENTATION IN TURKEY.—Question, Mr. Stevenson (Suffolk, Eye); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 640

ADMINISTRATION OF THE EAST AFRICA PROTECTORATE—DISMISSAL OF MR. HOPTON.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answer, Earl Percy 640

EAST AFRICA AND UGANDA FINANCES.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason; Answer, Earl Percy 641

SPIRIT DISTILLATION IN ENGLAND.—Question, Mr. William McKillop (Sligo, N.); Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 641

TOBACCO AND THE BUDGET.—Questions, Mr. Lambert and Mr. M'Crae (Edinburgh, E.); Answers, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 642

TELEPHONIC COMMUNICATION BETWEEN COUNTRY VILLAGES AND MARKET TOWNS. Question, Captain Bagot (Westmorland, Kendal); Answer, The Postmaster-General (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 642

ANKYLOSTOMIASIS.—Question, Mr. Johnson (Gateshead); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Cochrane, Ayrshire, N.) 643

PROSECUTIONS FOR PALMISTRY, ETC., FRAUDS.—Question, Mr. John Campbell; Answer, Mr. Cochrane 643

CALF LYMPH—DISPOSAL OF CALVES.—Questions, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answers, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.) 644

July 5.]

Page

TRAFFIC REGULATIONS IN THE PARKS.—Question, Mr. Scott-Montagu (Hampshire, New Forest); Answer, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley) 645

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE LEAFLETS.—Question, Mr. A. K. Loyd (Berkshire, Abingdon); Answer, Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes (Huntingdonshire, Ramsey) .. 645

STOOKESTOWN DRAINAGE DISTRICT.—Question, Mr. James O'Kelly (Roscommon, N.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) .. 646

IRISH SCHOOL TEACHERS' REMUNERATION—KILRUSH.—Questions, Mr. P. A. McHugh (Leitrim, N.) and Mr. Thomas O'Donnell, Kerry, W.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 646

TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION ACT—RETURN OF OFFICIALS.—Question, Mr. Joyce (Limerick); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 648

IRISH INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION—SYSTEM OF INSPECTION.—Questions, Mr. Flynn; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 649

BLAKENEY ESTATE, CO. GALWAY.—Question, Mr. Roche (Galway, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 650

IRISH DEVELOPMENT GRANT BILL—PETTY SESSIONS CLERKS FUND.—Question, Mr. O'Shee (Waterford, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 650

KERRY RENT APPEALS.—Questions, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell, Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.) and Mr. Flavin; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 651

AMALGAMATION OF OFFICES OF ANTRIM AND BELFAST CLERKS OF THE PEACE.—Questions, Mr. Joseph Devlin (Kilkenny, N.) and Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 651

WESTROPP ESTATE, CO. CLARE.—Question, Mr. Sheehy (Meath, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 652

POLICE CONSTABLE MOLLOY, ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 652

GREENCASTLE POLICE FORCE.—Questions, Mr. Joseph Devlin and Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 653

ADMINISTRATION OF THE ARMS ACT AT MARYBOROUGH.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 654

COMYN KENNY ESTATE, CO. GALWAY.—Question, Mr. Roche; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 654

MILTOWN-MALBAY PETTY SESSIONS CLERK.—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien (Kilkenny); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 655

LAND PURCHASE BY CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD IN COUNTY SLIGO.—Question, Mr. O'Dowd (Sligo, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 656

HARLECH ESTATE, COUNTY SLIGO.—Question, Mr. O'Dowd; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 656

RIVER OWENMORE DRAINAGE.—Question, Mr. O'Dowd; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 657

July 5.] *Page*

Congested Districts Board—Examination for Temporary Clerkships.—Question, Mr. Field ; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 657

Irish National School Teachers' Pay.—Question, Mr. Field ; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 658

Irish Congested District Board Staff.—Question, Mr. Field ; Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.) 658

Bills of Exchange Act (1882) Amendment Bill [Lords].—Read the first time ; to be read a second time upon Monday next and to be printed. [Bill 257.] 659

New Member Sworn.—John Sharpe Higham, esquire, for the County of York, Northern part of the West Riding (Sowerby Division) 659

Licensing Bill (Procedure).—Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Question [1st July], "That the proceedings in Committee and on Report of the Licensing Bill shall be brought to a conclusion in the manner hereinafter mentioned on six allotted days :

(*a*) The proceedings in Committee on Clause 1 on the first allotted day.

(*b*) The proceedings in Committee in Clauses 2 and 3 on the second allotted day.

(*c*) The proceedings in Committee on Clause 4 on the third allotted day.

(*d*) The proceedings in Committee on the remaining clauses of the Bill, and on any new Government clauses, and on schedules and any new Government schedules, and any other proceedings necessary to bring the Committee stage to a conclusion on the fourth allotted day.

(*e*) The proceedings on Report on any new clauses and on Amendments to Clauses 1, 2, and 3 of that Bill, be brought to a conclusion on the fifth allotted day; and

(*f*) The proceedings on Report be concluded on the sixth allotted day.

After this Order comes into operation, any day shall be considered an allotted day for the purposes of this Order on which the Licensing Bill is put down as the first Order of the Day.

At 11 p.m. on the said allotted days, or if the day is a Friday at 4.30 p.m. the Chairman or Speaker shall put forthwith the Questoin or Questions on any Amendment or Motion already proposed from the Chair, and shall next proceed successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments moved by the Government of which notice has been given (but no other Amendments) and on every Question necessary to dispose of the allotted business to be concluded on the allotted day.

In the case of Government Amendments, or of Government new clauses or schedules, he shall put only the Question that the Amendment be made, or that the clause or schedule be added to the Bill, as the case may be.

At 12 midnight on the day on which the Third Reading of the Bill is put down as first Order, or, if that day is a Friday, at 5.30 p.m., the Speaker shall put forthwith any Question necessary to conclude the proceedings on that stage of the Bill.

Proceedings to which this Order relates shall not be interrupted (except at an Afternoon Sitting at 7.30 p.m.), under the provisions of any Standing Order relating to Sittings of the House.

After the passing of this Order, on any day on which any proceedings on the Licensing Bill stand as the first Order of the Day, no dilatory Motion on the Bill, nor under Standing Order No. 10, nor Motion to postpone a clause, shall be received unless moved by the Minister in charge of the Bill, and the Question on any such Motion shall be put forthwith. Nor shall any opposed Private Business be set down at the Evening Sitting for consideration on any of the allotted days or on the day on which the Third Reading of the Bill is put down as first Order.

If Progress be reported the Chairman shall put this Order in force in any subsequent sitting of the Committee."—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

Question again proposed.

Mr. Lloyd-George (*Carnarvon Boroughs*) 661

Amendment proposed—

" In line 2, to leave out the words 'in Committee and."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question proposed, " That the words 'in Committee and' stand part of the Question.

Mr. David MacIver (*Liverpool, Kirkdale*) 661
Mr. Gibson Bowles (*Lynn Regis*) 662
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (*Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.*) 663
Major Jameson (*Clare, W.*) 664

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 220 ; Noes, 160. (Division List No. 189.)

Mr. Yoxall (*Nottingham, W.*) 667

Amendment proposed—

" In line 2, to leave out the words 'and on Report.' "—(*Mr. Yoxall.*)

Question proposed, " That the words 'and on Report' stand part of the Question."

Mr A. J. Balfour 669
Mr. Dalziel (*Kirkcaldy Burghs*) 670
Mr. McKenna (*Monmouthshire, N.*) 671
Mr. Samuel Evans (*Glamorganshire, Mid.*) 672
Sir Robert Reid (*Dumfries Burghs*) 673

July 5.] Page

Mr. Whitley (Halifax) .. 674
Mr. Lloyd-George .. 675
Dr. Hutchinson (Sussex, Rye) .. 676

Question put.

The House divided: Ayes, 258; Noes, 188. (Division List No. 190.)

Dr. Macnamara .. 682

Amendment proposed—

"In line 3, to leave out the word 'six.' and insert the word 'eighteen.'"—(*Dr. Macnamara.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'six' stand part of the Question."

Mr. Emmott (Oldham) .. 684
Mr. Cohen (Islington, E.) .. 684
Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton) .. 685
Mr. A. J. Balfour .. 686
Sir Robert Reid .. 690
Mr. Henry Hobhouse (Somersetshire, E.) .. 691
Mr. McKenna .. 692
Mr. Gibson Bowles .. 693
Sir Edward Grey (Northumberland, Berwick) .. 694
Mr. Lough (Islington, W.) .. 696
Sir John Gorst (Cambridge University) .. 697
Mr. Ellis Griffiths (Anglesey) .. 698
Mr. Tritton (Lambeth, Norwood) .. 700
Mr. Charles Douglas (Lanarkshire, N.W.) .. 700
Mr. T. W Russell (Tyrone, S.) .. 702
Sir J. Stirling Maxwell (Glasgow, College) .. 704
Mr. Lloyd-George .. 704
Mr. Malcolm (Suffolk, Stowmarket) .. 706
Mr. Samuel Evans .. 707
Sir J. Fergusson (Manchester, N.E.) .. 708
Mr. Renwick (Newcastle-on-Tyne) .. 708
Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) .. 709
Mr. Theodore Tayor (Lancashire, Radcliffe) .. 710
Mr. Tomkinson (Cheshire, Crewe) .. 710

Question put.

The House divided: Ayes, 260; Noes, 202. (Division List, No. 191.)

Main Question again proposed.

Mr. Balfour rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put"

The House divided: Ayes, 265; Noes, 201. (Division List No. 192.)

Question put accordingly.

The House divided: Ayes, 262; Noes, 207. (Division List No. 193.)

Ordered, That the proceedings in Committee and on Report of the Licensing Bill shall be brought to a conclusion in the manner hereinafter mentioned on six allotted days.

(a) The proceedings in Committee on Clause 1 on the first allotted day.

(b) The proceedings in Committee on Clauses 2 and 3 on the second allotted day.

(c) The proceedings in Committee on Clause 4 on the third allotted day.

(d) The proceedings in Committee on the remaining clauses of the Bill, and on any new Government clauses, and on schedules and any new Government schedules, and any other proceedings necessary to bring the Committee stage to a conclusion on the fourth allotted day.

(e) The proceedings on Report on any new clauses and on Amendments to Clauses 1, 2, and 3, of that Bill, be brought to a conclusion on the fifth allotted day ; and

(f) The proceedings on Report be concluded on the sixth allotted day.

After this Order comes into operation, any day shall be considered an allotted day for the purposes of this Order on which the Licensing Bill is put down as the first Order of the Day.

At 11 p.m. on the said allotted days, or if the day is a Friday at 4.30 p.m., the Chairman or Speaker shall put forthwith the Question or Questions on any Amendment or Motion already proposed from the Chair, and shall next proceed successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments moved by the Government of which notice has been given (but no other Amendments) and on every Question necessary to dispose of the allotted business to be concluded on the allotted day.

In the case of Government Amendments, or of Government new clauses or schedules, he shall put only the Question that the Amendment be made, or that the clause or schedule be added to the Bill, as the case may be.

At 12 midnight on the day on which the Third Reading of the Bill is put down as first Order, or if that day is a Friday, at 5.30 p.m., the Speaker shall put forthwith any Question necessary to conclude the proceedings on that stage of the Bill.

Proceedings to which this Order relates shall not be interrupted (except at an Afternoon Sitting at 7.30. p.m.) under the provisions of any Standing Order relating to Sittings of the House.

After the passing of this Order, on any day on which any proceedings on the Licensing Bill stand as the first Order of the Day, no dilatory Motion on the Bill, nor under Standing Order No. 10, nor Motion to postpone a clause, shall be received unless moved by the Minister in charge of the Bill, and the Question on any such Motion shall be put forthwith. Nor shall any opposed Private Business be set down at the Evening Sitting for consideration on any of the allotted days or on the day on which the Third Reading of the Bill is put down as first Order.

If Progress be reported, the Chairman shall put this Order in force in any subsequent sitting of the Committee.

July 5.] Page

EVENING SITTING.

Licensing Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. Lowther (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 1 :—

Mr. Helme (*Lancashire, Lancaster*) 727

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 7, after the word 'unsuitable,' to insert the word 'otherwise.'"—(*Mr. Helme.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'otherwise' be there inserted."

Mr. H. C. Richards (*Finsbury, E.*) 728
Sir Robert Reid (*Dumfries Burghs*) 729
The Solicitor-General (*Sir Edward Carson, Dublin University*) 729
Mr. H. D. Greene (*Shrewsbury*) 730

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 125 ; Noes, 117. (Division List No. 194.)

Mr. J. H. Lewis (*Flint Boroughs*) 733

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 7, after the word 'unsuitable,' to insert the words 'or have been subject to frequent changes of tenancy.'"—(*Mr. J. H. Lewis.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

The Secretary of State for the Home Department (*Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's*) 735

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 123 ; Noes, 194. (Division List No. 195.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 7, after the third word 'or' to insert the words 'on any ground or.'"—(*Mr. Herbert Roberts.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Akers-Douglas 739

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

July 5.] *Page*

Mr. Herbert Roberts .. 739

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 8, after the word 'character,' to insert the words 'or conduct of the actual holder of the licence.'"—(*Mr. Herbert Roberts.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr Akers-Douglas .. 740
Mr. Broadhurst (*Leicester*) .. 740

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 132 ; Noes, 226. (Division List No. 196.)
Mr. Lawrence (*Liverpool, Abercromby*) .. 745

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 8, after the word 'character,' to insert the words 'conduct of his business by.'"—(*Mr. Lawrence.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir Edward Carson .. 746

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 150 ; Noes, 228. (Division List No. 197.)

Mr. Herbert Roberts .. 753

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 8, after the word 'fitness,' to insert the words 'or contracted rights or liabilities as regards the licensed premises.'"—(*Mr. Herbert Roberts.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir Edward Carson .. 754
Sir Robert Reid .. 754

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 151 ; Noes, 251. (Division List No. 198.)

Mr. Whitley .. 759

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 8, to leave out the word, 'proposed.'"—(*Mr. Whitley.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'proposed' stand part of the clause."

Sir Edward Carson .. 760

Question put.

July 5.] **Page**

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 245 ; Noes, 151. (Division List No. 199.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 9, after the word 'licence' to insert the words 'on the ground that the renewal would be void.'"—(*Sir Edward Carson.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Herbert Roberts 763

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 9, after the word 'licence,' to insert the words 'or that any conditions upon which the licence was granted have not been fulfilled.'"—(*Mr. Herbert Roberts.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir Edward Carson 765
Sir Robert Reid 765
Sir Edward Carson 766
Mr. Moulton (*Cornwall, Launceston*) 766

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Sir James Woodhouse (*Huddersfield*) 766

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 9, after the words last inserted, to insert the words 'except in county boroughs.'"—(*Sir James Woodhouse.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."—*Sir Edward Carson* 767

And, it being Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again to-morrow.

Registration of Nurses.—Ordered, That Mr. Lyell be discharged from the Select Committee, and that Mr. Charles Hobhouse be added.—(*Mr. Herbert Gladstone.*) 764

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill.—Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill."—(*Mr. Bonar Law.*) 764

Registration of Nurses.—Ordered, That Mr. Malcolm be discharged from the Select Committee, and that Mr. Mount be added.—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*) 764

Adjourned at four minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: WEDNESDAY, 6TH JULY, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Barrow-in-Furness Corporation Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time 769

Barry Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill [LORDS]; Oakengates and Dawley Joint Water Board Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed .. 769

Milwr and District Mines Drainage Bill [LORDS] (BY ORDER).—Consideration as amended, deferred till Tuesday next 769

Airdrie Corporation Gas Order Confirmation Bill [LORDS]; Wishaw Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [Lords]. Considered, to be read the third time upon Friday 769

Arbroath Corporation Water Order Confirmation Bill; Dunfermline District Water Order Confirmaton Bill. Read a second time; to be considered upon Friday 769

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP 9).—Sir EDWARD STRACHEY reported from the Committee on Group 9 of Railway Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Tuesday, 19th July, at half-past Eleven of the clock 769

Report to lie upon the Table.

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.—Petitions against: from Andover; Arnold; Arreton (two); Ashington; Awsworth; Ayr (two); Barnsley; Barrugh; Batley; Beccles; Blackburn; Blyth; Bolton (two); Broughton; Bucksburn; Bungay; Carlton; Chester le Street; Choppington (two); Clanville; Coedpoeth; Croydon; Cudworth; Cymmaes; Darfield; Deansgate; Dodworth; East Kirkby; Edge Hill; Egremont (three); Esholt; Gawber; Glamorgan (three); Glasgow; Gorseinon; Great Houghton; Grimesthorpe; Guisboro'; Hartlepool; Hemsworth; Hetton le Hole; High Wycombe; Hirst; Hove; Hurstbourne Priors; Keighley; Kensington; Leyland; Llwynhendy; Low Green; Lower Chute; Malton; Middlewich; Moor Row (three); Morpeth; Milton Green; New Basford; Newchurch; New Lenton; North Walsham; Nottingham (two); Osmaston; Overton; Portmadoc; Preston; Rhyl; Royston; St. Andrews; St. Mervn; Saltney; Seghill; Shafton; Sheffield; Shoreditch; South Hindley; Sowerby; Staincross; Stockport (two); Stone; Sunderland (two); Thruxton; Tranmere; Tregonna; Tulse Hill; Warrington; Weston Point; Wherwell; Whitchurch; Whittington; Wigton; Willington-on-Tyne; and Worthing; to lie upon the Table 769

LICENSING BILL.—Petition from Nottingham, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 770

SEA FISHERIES BILL [LORDS].—Petition from Lowestoft, against; to lie upon the Table 770

July 6.] *Page*

Shop Hours Bill.—Petition of the Scottish Trade Protection Society, against; to lie upon the Table 770

Valuation Bill.—Petitions for alteration, from Cannock; and Howden; to lie upon the Table. 770

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Board of Education.—Copy presented, of Regulations for the Instruction and Training of Pupil Teachers from 1st August, 1904, to 31st July, 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 770

Government Laboratory.—Copy presented, of Report of the Principal Chemist upon the work of the Government Laboratory for the year ended 31st March, 1904, with Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 770

Superannuation.—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 30th June, 1904, declaring that for the due and efficient discharge of the duties of the office of Director of Barrack Construction, War Office, professional or other peculiar qualifications not ordinarily to be acquired in the Public Service are required [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 770

Trade Reports.—Copy presented, of Index to Reports of His Majesty's Diplomatic and Consular Representatives Abroad on Trade and Subjects of General Interest (with Appendix), 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 771

Trade with Persia.—Copy presented, of Report on the Condition and Prospects of British Trade in Persia, by H. W. Maclean, Special Commissioner of the Commercial Intelligence Committee of the Board of Trade [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 771

Trade Reports (Annual Series).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3202 to 3206 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 771

Fishery Board (Scotland).—Copy presented, of Twenty-second Annual Report of the Fishery Board for Scotland, being for the year 1903. Part III. Scientific Investigations [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 771

Diplomatic Reports (Coal).—Return ordered, "of Extracts relating to Coal from the Reports received up to the present date from His Majesty's Diplomatic and Consular Officers Abroad for 1903."—(*Mr. Fenwick.*) .. 771

Iron and Steel, 1903.—Copy ordered, "of Memorandum and Statistical Tables showing the production and consumption of Iron Ore and Pig Iron, and the production of Steel in the United Kingdom and the principal Foreign Countries in recent years, and the Imports and Exports of certain classes of Iron and Steel Manufactures (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 240, of Session 1903)."—(*Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) 771

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Accidents Caused by Motor-Cars, Horses, and Horse-drawn Vehicles.—Question, Mr. Scott-Montagu (Hampshire, New Forest); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 772

Page

YDE PARK CORNER—SLIPPERY WOOD PAVEMENT.—Question, Mr. H. C. Richards (Finsbury, E.); Answer, Lord Balcarres 773

ISPOSAL OF BRONZE LIONS FROM BRITISH MUSEUM.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answer, Lord Balcarres 773

ISPOSAL OF COLONNADE FROM BURLINGTON HOUSE.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Lord Balcarres 773

UTDOOR MEDICAL RELIEF IN THE METROPOLIS.—Question, Sir Walter Foster (Derbyshire, Ilkeston); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 774

DULTERATION OF FOOD—RECOMMENDATIONS OF ROYAL COMMISSION.—Question, Sir Cuthbert Quilter (Suffolk, Sudbury); Answer, Mr. Walter Long .. 774

EPORT OF BOILER COMMITTEE.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 775

Y-LAWS UNDER THE EMPLOYMENT OF CHILDREN ACT.—Question, Mr. Tennant (Berwickshire); Answer, Mr. Graham Murray 775

EW SCHEME FOR WHITSTABLE CHARITIES.—Question, Mr. Slack (Hertfordshire, St. Albans); Answer, Mr. Griffith Boscawen 775

R. J. ROBINSON'S FARM AT BALLINACROSS.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell (Longford, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 776

ALE OF THE O'BRIEN ESTATE.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 776

ROMOTION OF SERGEANT RYAN—ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr Wyndham 776

ELFAST POLICE—ALLEGED PREFERENCE GIVEN TO ROMAN CATHOLICS.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 777

ECORATIONS AT ROUNDSTONE—ACTION OF POLICE.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 778

ST OF CONVEYING MILITIA ARTILLERY FROM THE NORTH TO PORTSMOUTH.—Question, Sir John Colomb (Great Yarmouth); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 778

ORTH OF ENGLAND MILITIA ARTILLERY TRAINING.—Question, Sir John Colomb; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 779

TENDANCE OF A DEPUTY JUDGE ADVOCATE AT COURTS-MARTIAL IN INDIA.—Question, Mr. H. D. Greene (Shrewsbury); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 780

EDAL FOR NAVAL SERVICE AGAINST FENIANS IN 1868.—Question, Mr. Moon (St. Pancras, N.); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 780

PORT DUTY ON MAGAZINES IN AUSTRALIA.—Question, Mr. Runciman (Dewsbury); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 780

July 6.]

Page

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

ADMIRALTY CONTRACTORS AND THE FAIR WAGES RESOLUTION—CASE OF MESSRS. LYSAGHT, OF BRISTOL.—Questions, Mr. Charles Hobhouse (Bristol, E.) and Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answers, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge) 781

MACHINE GUNS IN THE REGULAR ARMY.—Question, Captain Norton (Newington, W.); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Mr. Bromley Davenport, Cheshire, Macclesfield) 782

WAR OFFICE CONTRACTS—MESSRS. LYSAGHT AND THE FAIR WAGES RESOLUTION.—Questions, Mr. Charles Hobhouse, Sir Charles Dilke, Mr. Broadhurst (Leicester) and Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar); Answers, Mr. Bromley Davenport 782

RETIRED VOLUNTEERS.—Question, Mr. Charles Allen (Gloucestershire, Stroud); Answer, Mr. Bromley Davenport 784

EXPENDITURE ON RIFLE RANGES.—Question, Mr. Tillett (Norwich); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) 784

SOUTH AFRICAN CONSTABULARY.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington) 784

SUNDAY LABOUR IN TRANSVAAL MINES.—Questions, Mr. Slack (Hertfordshire, St. Albans), Mr. Markham (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield) and Mr. Whitley (Halifax); Answers, Mr. Lyttelton 786

BOER REPATRIATION—EXPENDITURE.—Questions, Mr. Bryn Roberts (Carnarvonshire, Eifion) and Mr. Markham; Answers, Mr. Lyttelton 786

REPATRIATION LOAN.—Question, Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 787

THE SOMALI MULLAH.—Question, Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 787

ADMINISTRATION OF SOMALILAND.—Question, Mr. Charles Hobhouse; Answer, Earl Percy 787

SOMALILAND PROTECTORATE BOUNDARIES AND ADMINISTRATION.—Question, Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.); Answer, Earl Percy 788

SUGAR CONVENTION—EXPENDITURE.—Question, Mr. Samuel Young (Cavan, E.); Answer, Earl Percy 788

MACEDONIA—EUROPEAN OFFICERS OF GENDARMERIE.—Question, Mr. Charles Allen; Answer, Earl Percy 789

PROOF SPIRIT IN SWEETS IMPORTED FROM THE CONTINENT—RESTRICTION OF SALE.—Questions, Mr. Herbert Roberts (Denbighshire, W.) and Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 789

July 6.]

Page

ALCOHOL FOR MANUFACTURING PURPOSES.—Questions, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.) Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (Kerry, W.), Major Jameson (Clare, W.) and Mr. Kilbride (Kildare, S.); Answers, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 790

MAILS IN COUNTY FERMANAGH.—Question, Mr. Edward Mitchell (Fermanagh, N.); Answer, The Postmaster-General (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 791

GOVERNMENT EDUCATION GRANT—METHOD OF DISTRIBUTION.—Questions, Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.); Answers, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 792

IRISH AGRICULTURAL ORGANISATION SOCIETY.—Question, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.) and Mr. Flynn (Cork County, N.); Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 792

LAND PURCHASE—THE MACGILLYCUDDY'S ESTATE, COUNTY KERRY.—Question, Mr. Murphy; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 793

AMERICAN DUTIES ON IRISH CURED FISH.—Questions, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell and Mr. Flavin; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 794

BLENNERHASSETTS ESTATE, KERRY—CASE OF DANIEL MURPHY.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 795

FISHING RIGHTS AT BALLYNAHINCH.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 795

GAME RIGHTS ON THE CLANRICARDE ESTATE, COUNTY GALWAY.—Questions, Mr. Roche, (Galway, E.) and Mr. Kilbride; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 795

LARNE URBAN COUNCIL.—Question, Mr. Joseph Devlin (Kilkenny, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 797

BELFAST CORPORATION—OUTBREAKS OF INFECTIOUS DISEASE.—Question, Mr. Joseph Devlin; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 797

TOBACCO GROWING IN IRELAND.—Questions, Mr. David Morgan (Essex, Walthamstow) and Mr. Flavin; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 798

RATHMINES COMMISSIONERS AND THE DUBLIN COUNTY COUNCIL.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 799

TRAWLING IN MUIR BAY.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 799

BLACKLION DISPENSARY—ENNISKILLEN UNION.—Question, Mr. Jordan, (Fermanagh, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 799

BALLINARLOE UNION MEDICAL OFFICER.—Questions, Mr. Roche and Mr. Flavin; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 800

IRISH AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENTAL—CATHOLIC CLERKS IN THE VETERINARY BRANCH.—Questions, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 801

LABOURERS (IRELAND) ACT—COST OF REGISTRATION OF TITLE.—Question, Mr. O'Shee (Waterford, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 802

THE ANGLO-FRENCH CONVENTION.—Questions, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 802

LABOURERS (IRELAND) ACT AMENDMENT BILL.—Questions, Mr. John Redmond (Waterford) and Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 804

BUDGET PROPOSAL AFFECTING STRIPPED TOBACCO.—Question, Mr. Charles M'Arthur (Liverpool, Exchange); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 804

COMMITTEE OF NATIONAL DEFENCE.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 805

PASSIVE RESISTERS.—Questions, Mr. Alfred Davies (Carmarthen Boroughs); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 805

THE OPERATIONS IN TIBET.—Questions, Mr. Gibson Bowles and Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 806

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Questions, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. John Redmond, Mr. William Moore (Antrim, N.) and Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 807

ACCESS TO AND FROM THE HOUSE.—Questions, Mr. Louis Sinclair (Essex, Romford); Answers, Mr. Speaker 807

Licensing Bill [1st ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 1:—

Amendment again proposed—

"In page 1, line 9, after the words last inserted, to insert the words 'except in county boroughs.'"—(*Sir James Woodhouse.*)

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Sir Robert Reid (*Dumfries Burghs*) 809

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 9, after the words 'last inserted,' to insert the words 'or any of the before-mentioned grounds in combination with any other ground.'"—(*Sir Robert Reid.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

The Solicitor-General (*Sir Edward Carson, Dublin University*) 810
Mr. Whitley (*Halifax*) 810
Sir Robert Reid 811

Mr. Whittaker (Yorkshire, W.R., Spen Valley) .. 811
Mr. Groves (Salford, S.) .. 811
Mr. Tomkinson (Cheshire, Crewe) .. 811
Sir Arthur Bignold (Wicks Burghs) .. 812
Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.) .. 812
Sir Edward Carson .. 812
Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice (Wiltshire, Cricklade) .. 813
Mr. Austin Taylor (Liverpool, East Toxteth) .. 814
Colonel Pilkington (Lancashire, Newton) .. 815

Question put.

The Committee divided : Ayes, 176 ; Noes, 255. (Division List, No. 200.)

Mr. McKenna (Monmouthshire, N.) .. 819

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 9, to leave out from the words last inserted to the word 'shall' in line 10."—(*Mr. McKenna.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'shall' stand part of the clause."

The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) .. 821
Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice .. 822
Mr. Brigg (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley) .. 822
Mr. Cripps (Lancashire, Stretford) .. 823

Question put.

The Committee divided : Ayes, 250 ; Noes, 182. (Division List No. 201.)

Mr. Ellis Griffith (Anglesey) .. 827

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 9, after the word 'shall' to insert the words 'in county areas.'"—(*Mr. Ellis Griffith.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir Edward Carson .. 829

Question put.

The Committee divided : Ayes, 178 ; Noes, 265. (Division List No. 202.)

Mr. Herbert Roberts (Denbighshire, W.) .. 835

Amendment proposed—

"In page ,1 line 9, after the word 'shall,' to insert the words 'in the event of quarter sessions deciding to impose in respect of all on licences within their area the charges referred to in Section 3, Sub-section (1), of the Act.'"—(*Mr. Herbert Roberts.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

July 6.]

Page

Sir Edward Carson .. 836
Mr. Shackleton .. 836
Mr. Asquith (*Fifeshire, E.*) .. 837
Sir Edward Carson .. 838
Mr. Disraeli (*Cheshire, Altrincham*) .. 838

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 176 ; Noes, 267. (Division List No. 203.)

Mr. J. H. Lewis .. 843

Amendment proposed—

> " In page 1, line 9, after the word ' shall,' to insert the words, ' when quarter sessions so determine.' "—(*Mr. J. H. Lewis.*)

Question proposed, " That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Akers-Douglas .. 844
Mr. Munro Ferguson (*Leith Burghs*) .. 844
Mr. Charles Hobhouse (*Bristol, E.*) .. 845
Mr. J. H. Lewis .. 845
Mr. Johnson (*Gateshead*) .. 846
Mr. Whitley .. 846
Mr. Lambert (*Devonshire, South Molton*) .. 846

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 116 ; Noes, 271. (Division List No. 204.)

Mr. Henry Hobhouse (*Somersetshire, E.*) .. 851

Amendment proposed—

> " In page 1, line 9, after the word ' shall ' to insert the words ' subject to the provisions of this section for inquiry and report by licensing justices.' "—(*Mr. Henry Hobhouse.*)

Question proposed, " That those words be there inserted."

Sir Edward Carson .. 853
Mr. Cripps .. 854
Mr. Duke (*Plymouth*) .. 855
Mr. Talbot (*Oxford University*) .. 856
Mr. Peel (*Manchester, S.*) .. 856
Sir Edward Carson .. 856
Mr. Henry Hobhouse .. 856
Mr. Talbot .. 858
Mr. Austin Taylor .. 858

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 192 ; Noes, 251. (Division List No. 205.)

Mr. James Woodhouse .. 863

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 9, to leave out from the word 'in,' to the word 'but,' in line 10, and insert the words 'a committee, one half of whom in every case shall be elected by the justices of the licensing district from their own number, and one half by the county council from their own number.' "—(*Sir James Woodhouse.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'quarter sessions' stand part of the clause."

The President of the Local Government Board (*Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.*) 864

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 245 ; Noes, 151. (Division List No. 206.)

Mr. Duke 869

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

Licensing Bill [1st Allotted Day].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. Lowther (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 1 :—

Mr. Duke 869

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 9, after the word 'sessions,' to insert the words 'acting as an administrative body.' "—(*Mr. Duke.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir Edward Carson 871
Sir Albert Rollit (*Islington, S.*) 872
Sir James Woodhouse 875
Mr. H. C. Richards (*Finsbury, E.*) 876

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 132 ; Noes, 124. (Division List No. 207.)

Mr. Ellis Griffith 879

July 6.] Page

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 9, to leave out the words 'instead of,' and insert the words 'sitting with.'"—(*Mr. Ellis Griffith.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Sir Edward Carson 879

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 210; Noes, 128. (Division List No. 208.)

Mr. Munro Ferguson 883

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 10, to leave out the word 'but,' and insert the word 'and.'"—(*Mr. Munro Ferguson.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'but' stand part of the clause."

Sir Edward Carson 886
Mr. Bousfield (Hackney, N.) 887
Mr. Whittaker 888

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 264; Noes, 167. (Division List No. 209.)

Mr. Asquith 891

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 10, to leave out from the word 'but' to the end of line 12."—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 279; Noes, 210. (Division List No. 210.)

And, it being after Eleven of the clock, the Chairman proceeded, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 5th July, successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendment moved by the Government of which notice had been given, and on every Question necessary to dispose of the allotted Business to be concluded on the first allotted Day.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 13, after the word 'an,' to insert the word 'existing.'—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

“ In page 1 line 16, after the word ‘ district,’ to insert the words ‘ on the consideration by them, in accordance with the Licensing Acts, 1828 to 1902, of applications for the renewal of licences.’ ”—(*Mr. Secretary Akers Douglas.*)

Question, “ That the Amendment be made,” put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

“ In page 1, line 17, after the word ‘ particular,’ to insert the word ‘ existing. ’ ”—(*Mr. Secretary Akers Douglas.*)

Question, “ That the Amendment be made,” put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

“ In page 1, line 19, after the word ‘ an,’ to insert the word “ existing.”—(*Mr. Secretary Akers Douglas.*)

Question, “ That the Amendment be made,” put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

“ In page 1, line 23, after the word ‘ premises,’ to insert the words ‘ and unless it appears to quarter sessions unnecessary, any other persons appearing to them to be interested in the question of the renewal of the licence of those premises. ’ ”—(*Mr. Secretary Akers Douglas.*)

Question put, “ That the Amendment be made.”

The Committee divided ; Ayes 285 ; Noes, 198. (Division List No. 211.)

Question put, “ That Clause 1, as amended, stand part of the Bill.”

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 281 ; Noes, 194. (Division List No. 212.)

And, it being after Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again upon Monday next.

Motion made, and Question proposed, “ That this House do now adjourn.”

Mr. Dalziel (*Kirkcaldy Burghs*) 913
Mr. Flynn (*Cork County, N.*) 914
Mr. Swift MacNeill (*Donegal, S.*) 914
The Secretary of State for India (*Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford*) . 914
Mr. Lough (*Islington, W.*) 916

Quesion put, and agreed to.

Adjourned at twenty-five minutes before One o'clock.

Page

HOUSE OF LORDS: THURSDAY, 7TH JULY, 1904.

LORD HENNIKER.—Ordered, That the Report of the Lord Chancellor of the United Kingdom, made to the House of Lords on Friday last, that the right of the Lord Henniker to vote at the elections of Representative Peers for Ireland has been established to his satisfaction, be sent to the Clerk of the Crown in Ireland, together with a certificate stating that such Report has been made and that the House has ordered it to be sent to the said Clerk of the Crown in Ireland 917

SAT FIRST.
The Duke of Richmond sat first in Parliament after the death of his father.

The Lord Hartismere (*L. Henniker*) sat first in Parliament after the death of his farther 917

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Thames River Steamboat Service Bill.—Strabane, Raphoe, and Convoy Railway Bill. Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee adjourned yesterday over this day; read, and ordered to lie on the Table .. 917

Saddleworth and Springhead Tramways Bill.—London County Council (General Powers) Bill. Examiner's Certificates of non-compliance with the Standing Orders referred to the Standing Orders Committee on Tuesday next 917

City of London (Central Criminal Court House) Bill.—Reported, without Amendment 917

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill.—London and India Docks Company Bill; Swindon Corporation Bill; Middlesbrough, Stockton-on Tees, and Thornaby Tramways Bill; Carlisle Corporation Bill; Clyde Navigation (Works) Bill. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Earl of Craven be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Lovat; read, and agreed to. 917

Strabane, Raphoe, and Convoy Railway Bill.—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Ashburton be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bill in the place of the Earl of Bradford; read, and agreed to 918

Leyton Urban District Council Bill. Moved, "That the order made on the 14th day of March last, 'That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 16th day of June next,' be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2ª; agreed to. Bill read 2ª accordingly and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection. 918

Buxton Urban District Council Bill [H.L.] Read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons 918

Soothill Nether Urban District Tramways Bill; Doncaster Corporation Bill; Skipton Water and Improvement Bill. Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 918

July 7.]

Page

Selby Urban District Council Bill.—Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; and referred to the Examiners 918

St. Mary Woolnoth Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to .. 918

Minehead Urban District Council Water Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments; the said Amendments considered, and agreed to 918

Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendment agreed to 918

Aberdeen Joint Passenger Station Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.] (No. 135).—A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order relating to Aberdeen Joint Passenger Station. And

Dumbartonshire (Vale of Leven) Water Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.] (No. 136).—A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order relating to Dumbartonshire (Vale of Leven) Water.—Were presented by the Earl Waldegrave (for the Lord Kintore (*E. Kintore*)); read 1ª; to be printed; and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899 (Section 7), deemed to have been read 2ª and reported from the Committee 918

Education Board Provisional Order (Cardiff) Bill. Moved, "That the order made on the 14th day of March last, 'That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 16th day of June next,' be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2ª"; agreed to. Bill read 2ª accordingly and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow 919

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]. House in Committee (according to order). The Amendments proposed by the Select Committee made; further Amendments made. Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received to-morrow 919

Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. House in Committee (according to order). Amendments made. Standing Committee negatived. The Report of the Amendments to be received to-morrow 919

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.];—Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [H.L.]. Amendments reported (according to order), and Bills to be read 3ª To-morrow 919

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill) [H.L.];—Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]. Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 919

PETITIONS.

SUPPLY OF ELECTRICITY BILL [H.L.].—Petition to be heard by Counsel against; of the Gas Companies Protection Association; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 919

OUTDOOR RELIEF (FRIENDLY SOCIETIES) BILL [H.L.].—Petition against; of the Guardians of the Poor of the Parish of Paddington; the Guardians of the Poor of the Chorley Union; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 919

July 7.]

Page

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.—Regulations for the instruction and training of pupil teachers (from 1st August, 1904, to 31st July, 1905).

Minute of the Board of Education, dated 7th July, 1904, modifying Code of Regulations for Public Elementary Schools, 1904 920

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—

No. 3204. Roumania.

No. 3205. Hayti.

No. 3206. Russia (Batoum).

No. 3207. United States (Oregon, Washington, and Idaho.)

No. 3208. Italy (Leghorn). 920

GOVERNMENT LABORATORY.—Report of the Principal Chemist upon the work of the Government Laboratory, for the year ended 31st March, 1904; with appendices 920

FISHERIES (SCOTLAND).—Twenty-second Annual Report of the Fishery Board for Scotland, being for the year 1903. Part III. Scientific Investigations .. 920

TRADE WITH PERSIA (BOARD OF TRADE COMMERCIAL INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEE).—Report on the condition and prospects of British trade in Persia, by H. W. Maclean, Special Commissioner of the Commercial Intelligence Committee of the Board of Trade 920

CONSULAR REPORTS.—Index to Reports of His Majesty's Diplomatic and Consular Representatives Abroad on Trade and Subjects of General Interest (with Appendix), 1903.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 920

SUPERANNUATION (PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS).—Treasury minute, dated 30th June, 1904, declaring that for the due and efficient discharge of the duties of the office of Director of Barrack Construction, War Office, professional or other peculiar qualifications not ordinarily to be acquired on the Public Service are required. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 920

CHANTREY TRUST.—The evidence taken before the Select Committee from time to time to be printed, but no copies to be delivered out except to members of the Committee, and such other persons as the Committee shall think fit, until further order. (No. 132.) 921

NEW BILLS.

Solway Salmon Fisheries Bill [H.L.].—A Bill to form part of the Solway Firth into a fishery district for the purposes of the Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Acts, 1861 to 1892, and to constitute a Board of Conservators of that district, and for other matters connected therewith—Was presented by the Earl of Onslow; read 1^{a}; to be printed; and to be read 2^{a} on Tuesday next. [No. 133.] 921

County Courts Bill [H.L.].—A Bill to amend the law relating to county courts—Was presented by the Lord Chancellor; read 1ª; and to be printed. [No. 134.] 921

Merchant Shipping Bill [H.L.]. [Third Reading.]—Order of the Day for the Third Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª."—(*Lord Wolverton.*)

Lord Ellenborough 921
Lord Wolverton 923

On Question, Bill read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

The Case of the "Antillian."—

Lord Muskerry 923
The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (The Marquess of Lansdowne) 926

The Maritime Conference at Brussels.—

Lord Muskerry 927
The Marquess of Lansdowne 929

The Pupil-Teacher System.—

Lord Herries 930
The Lord President of the Council and President of the Board of Education (The Marquess of Londonderry) 932
Lord Heneage 936
Lord Stanley of Alderley 937
Earl Spencer 941

Re-Vaccination Bill [H.L.].—Amendment reported (according to order) .. 942

House adjourned at ten minutes before Six o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: THURSDAY, 7TH JULY, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Provisional Order Bills [Lords] (Standing Orders applicable thereto Complied with).—Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.:—Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time to-morrow 942

Birkdale Improvement Bill; Crystal Palace District Gas Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 942

July 7.]

Page

Clyde Valley Electric Power Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 942

Selby Urban District Council Bill.—Read the third time, and passed. [New Title] 943

Southport and Lytham Tramroad (Extension of Time) Bill [Lords.]—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 943

Leith Corporation Tramways Order Confirmation Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 943

Glasgow Corporation (Police) Order Confirmation Bill.—Considered; to be read the third time upon Monday next 943

Liverpool and Wigan Churches Bill [Lords].—Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time .. 943

Portmadoc, Beddgelert, and South Snowdon Railway Bill [Lords]; North Wales Electric Power Bill [Lords]; Bristol Corporation Bill [Lords]; West Riding Tramways Bill [Lords]; Bournemouth Corporation (Tramways) Bill [Lords]; Holywood Tramways Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 943

Message from the Lords.—That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act for authorising the Urban District Council of Buxton to acquire from the Most Noble Spencer Compton, Duke of Devonshire, K.G., the Mineral Water Baths of Buxton, and to maintain and improve the same; and for other purposes." [Buxton Urban District Council Bill [Lords] 943

Buxton Urban District Council Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 943

PETITIONS.

Licensing Bill.—Petitions against; from Allendale and Catton; Appleton; Ashford; Axbridge; Aylesford; Banwell; Barnes and Mortlake; Blagdon; Boscastle; Bromley; Brown Hills; Cheddar; Churchill; Colchester; Dover; Dunstable; East Brent; Eastwood; Edinburgh (two); Farnborough; Farnworth and Kearsley; Fulham; Glasgow; Gondhurst and Kilndown; Grandborough; Hartlepool; Heighington; Houghton; Huntingdon; Latchford; Lee and Lewisham; Little Lever; Luddenden (two); Lymm; Lympsham; Martinscroft; Mitcham; Moore; Newcastle-on-Tyne (two); New Shildon; North Shields; Padgate; Penryn; Reading; Reddish; Rugeley; Salford; Sandford; Saltburn by the Sea; Seghill; Shelf; Shildon (three); Shipham; Southport; South Shields (two); Stockton Heath (two); Stockton-on-Tees; Sydenham; Tamerton Folliott; Toddington; Ubley; Warminster; Warrington (two); Wedmore; West Hartlepool; West Streatham; Whitley; and Wrington; to lie upon the Table 943

Licensing Bill.—Petition from Scarborough, against restriction of Debate, to lie upon the Table 944

Licensing Bill.—Petition from Sudbury, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 944

Page

PORT OF LONDON BILL.—Petition of the Conservators of the River Thames, against; to lie upon the Table 944

VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS ACT, 1897.—Petitions for alteration of Law; from Banbury; and Scarborough; to lie upon the Table 944

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.—Copy presented, of Minute of the Board of Education, dated 7th July, 1904, modifying Code of Regulations for Public Elementary Schools, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 944

ISLE OF MAN.—Account presented, of Revenue and Expenditure for the year ended 31st March, 1904, with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 241.] 944

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3207 and 3208 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 945

TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION (IRELAND) (OFFICIALS).—Return ordered, "Of officials employed upon the 1st day of June, 1904, by the various county boroughs and urban councils in Ireland in carrying out the provisions of the Technical Instruction (Ireland) Act, in the following form:—

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.
Name.	Description of office.	Salary.	Date of appointment.	Previous employment.	Tenure of office.

(*Mr. Joyce.*) 945

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

ELECTRICITY IN MINES.—Questions, Mr. Markham (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield); Answers, Mr. Akers Douglas 945

LABOURERS' COTTAGE SCHEMES IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. O'Shee (Waterford, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 946

CRUELTY TO HORSES IN MINES—VISITS OF HOME OFFICE INSPECTORS.—Question, Mr. Brooke Robinson (Dudley); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 947

PAY OF SEASON SUBSTITUTES IN BRISTOL POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Shackleton (Lancashire, Clitheroe); Answer, Lord Stanley 948

OVERTIME IN LUDGATE CIRCUS POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Horner (Lambeth, N.); Answer, Lord Stanley 949

July 7.] *Page*

CHARGES FOR LETTERS ADDRESSED TO CROMER POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Broadhurst (Leicester); Answer, Lord Stanley 949

ZANZIBAR—DIRECTION OF AFFAIRS DURING SULTAN'S MINORITY.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answer, Earl Percy 950

WHITSTABLE CHARITIES—ALLEGED MISUSE OF ENDOWMENT.—Question, Mr. Slack (Hertfordshire, St. Albans); Answer, Sir William Anson 950

DELAY IN ERECTION OF NATIONAL SCHOOL AT KNOCKNAGIN.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty (Donegal, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 951

POLICE HOUSE TO HOUSE VISITS IN THE MOY DISTRICT.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 951

DISTRIBUTION OF GUNS CAPTURED IN THE SOUTH AFRICAN AND CHINESE WARS.—Question, Mr. Coghill (Stoke-upon-Trent); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster .. 952

RECONSTRUCTION OF QUEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY FUND.—Question, Mr. H. C. Richards (Finsbury, E.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour.. 952

ORDER OF QUESTIONS.—Question, Mr. Coghill (Stoke-upon-Trent); Answer, Mr. Speaker 953

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

WARRANT OFFICERS AND NAVIGATING DUTIES.—Question, Mr. Edmund Roberston (Dundee); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge) 953

FELIXSTOWE MARTELLO TOWER.—Question, Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Mr. Bromley Davenport, Cheshire, Macclesfield) 954

BALL AND DUMMY CARTRIDGE.—Questions, Mr. Coghill (Stoke-upon-Trent); Answer, Mr. Bromley Davenport 954

CHINESE LABOUR FOR THE TRANSVAAL.—Question, Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington) 955

MALTESE BALANCE SHEET.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 955

THE OPERATIONS IN TIBET.—Questions, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs) and Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); Answers, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 955

SEIZURE OF THE "ALLANTON."—Questions, Sir Charles Cayzer (Barrow-in-Furness) Mr. Wolff (Belfast, E.) and Mr. Joseph Devlin (Kilkenny, N.); Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 956

PEMBA FREED SLAVE'S APPEAL.—Question, Mr. Bayley (Derbyshire, Chesterfield); Answer, Earl Percy 957

EXPENDITURE ON THE EAST AFRICAN AND UGANDA PROTECTORATE.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answer, Earl Percy 957

COLLECTION OF NEW TAXES.—Question, Mr. Edmund Robertson and Mr. Gibson-Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire) 957

IRISH EXCURSION TRAINS—LACK OF SANITARY ACCOMMODATION.—Question, Mr. Jordan (Fermanagh, S.); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) 959

BOROUGH RECORDERS AND THE LICENSING BILL.—Question, Sir Albert Rollit (Islington, S.); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) — 959

MOTOR-CARS IN LONDON STREETS—SPEED REGULATIONS.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason; Answer, The Secretary to the Local Government Board (Mr. Grant Lawson, Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) 960

CHESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL AND NON-PROVIDED SCHOOL TEACHERS' AGREEMENTS.—Questions, Mr. Boland; Answers, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 960

DELAY IN GRANTING PROBATES IN DUBLIN.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) 961

IRISH LAND PURCHASE—KENMORE ESTATE.—Questions, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.); Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) .. 961

CHILDREN'S COURTS IN IRELAND.—Questions, Mr. Hugh Law, (Donegal, W.) and Mr. Sloan; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 962

CARNANE ESTATE, COUNTY LIMERICK.—Question, Mr. Lundon (Limerick, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 962

KINOARA PIER AND HARBOUR.—Question, Mr. Joyce (Limerick); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 963

MAJOR FOX'S ESTATE—BALLYMACROSSIN KING'S COUNTY.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 963

LAND PURCHASE IN TIPPERARY—THOMAS DOWLING'S ESTATE.—Questions, Mr. Kendal O'Brien (Tipperary, Mid); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 964

DRAINAGE OF THE OWENMORE.—Questions, Mr. O'Dowd (Sligo, S.) and Mr. John Redmond (Waterford); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 965

IRISH SCHOOL HOUSE PLANS.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty (Donegal, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 965

POLICE CONSTABLE MOLLOY, ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 966

VALENTIA FERRY.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 966

July 7.] *Page*

United States Duties on Irish Fish.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 967

Land Purchase in County Donegal—Case of George Ward.—Question, Mr. Hugh Law; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 967

Kingston Estate, County Cork.—Questions, Mr. William Abraham (Cork County, N.E.), Mr. John Redmond, and Mr. Cullinan; Answers, Mr. Wyndham (Dover) 967

Miltown—Malbay Petty Session Clerk.—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien (Kilkenny); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 968

Tallow Police Force.—Question, Mr. O'Shee (Waterford, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 969

Labourers' Cottage Schemes in Ireland.—Question, Mr. O'Shee; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 969

Alleged Valuation Error at Dingle.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (Kerry, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 970

Millstreet Police Lodging-out Allowances.—Question, Mr. Sheehan (Cork County, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 971

Land Purchase in County Cavan—David Finlay's Estate.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy (Cavan, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 971

Learners in the Irish Postal Service.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy; Answer, The Postmaster General (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 972

Punishment in the Cork Post Office.—Question, Mr. J. F. X. O'Brien (Cork); Answer, Lord Stanley 973

Kinvara (Galway) Letter Deliveries.—Question, Mr. Joyce; Answer, Lord Stanley 974

Pay of Limerick Postmen.—Question, Mr. Joyce; Answer, Lord Stanley .. 974

Trinity College, Dublin.—Questions, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.) and Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.); Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 974

Behring Sea Seal Fisheries—Despatch of British Warship.—Questions, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 977

Sir Charles Eliot's Resignation—Conditions of Grant of Land to East African Syndicate.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 979

The Statement on Army Reform.—Questions, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs) and Mr. Wolff; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 979

The Aliens Bill.—Questions, Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe), Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.), Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, and Mr. Blake (Longford, S.); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 980

July 7.]

Page

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL'S "ORDERLY" QUESTION.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Speaker 981

THE PUBLIC IN THE CENTRAL HALL.—Question, Mr. Pierpoint (Warrington); Answer, Mr. Speaker 981

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS.—The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means .. 982

Aliens Bill.—Reported, so far as amended, in the Standing Committee on Law, etc.

Leave given to the Standing Committee to make a Special Report.

Special Report brought up, and read.

Report and Special Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 242.]

Minutes of Proceedings to be printed. [No. 242.] 982

Private Legislation Procedure (Wales) Bill.—Reported, without Amendment, from the Select Committee, with Special Report and Minutes of Evidence.

Special Report brought up, and read.

Report and Special Report to lie upon the Table and to be printed. [No. 243.] 983

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Mr. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection that they had discharged the following Members from the Standing Committee on Law, and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure:—Mr. Attorney-General, Major Seely, Mr. Dalziel, Mr. Peel, Mr. Claude Hay, Mr. Moon, Sir Harry Samuel, Mr. James Bailey, Mr. Seymour Ormsby-Gore, Mr. Theodore Taylor, Mr. Thomas Shaw, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. John Rutherford, Mr. Joyce, Mr. Hugh Law, Dr. Shipman, and Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree; and appointed in substitution: Mr. Solicitor-General, Mr. Shackleton, Mr. Colston, Mr. Lloyd Morgan, Mr. Dillon, Mr. Swift MacNeill, Mr. Jacoby, Mr. Matthew White Ridley, Lieutenant-Colonel Pryce-Jones, Mr. Henry Hobhouse, Mr. George Faber, Mr. Helder, Sir George Fardell, Sir George Bartley, Mr. Haldane, Mr. Samuel Evans, and Mr. Soares.

Report to lie upon the Table 983

NEW BILL.

University of Liverpool Bill.—"To extend the privileges of the Graduates of the University of Liverpool," presented by Sir John Brunner; supported by Mr. Haldane, Mr. W. F. Lawrence, Mr. Stock, Sir John Willox, Mr. Charles McArthur, Mr. David MacIver, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Houston, and Mr. Watson Rutherford; to be read a second time upon Thursday next, and to be printed. [Bill 259.] 983

July 7.] *Page*

SUPPLY [16TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1904–5.

CLASS III.

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That a sum not exceeding £71,342, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of the Irish Land Commission."

Mr. Cullinan (*Tipperary, S.*) 984

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That a sum not exceeding £70,342, be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. Cullinan.*)

Mr. T. W. Russell (*Tyrone, S.*) 988
The Chief Secretary for Ireland (*Mr. Wyndham, Dover*) 993
Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (*Kerry, W.*) 1001
Mr. Power (*Waterford, E.*) 1003
Mr. Murphy (*Kerry, E.*) 1004
Mr. Delany (*Queen's County, Ossory*) 1007
Mr. Hemphill (*Tyrone, N.*) 1009
Mr. Wyndham 1011
Mr. Coghill (*Stoke-upon-Trent*) 1014
Mr. John Redmond (*Waterford*) 1014
Mr. Lonsdale (*Armagh, Mid.*) 1014

Question put.

The Committee divided : Ayes, 112 ; Noes, 193. (Division List No. 213.)

Original Question put, and agreed to.

Resolution to be reported.

CLASS II.

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That a sum, not exceeding £21,773, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of Public Works in Ireland."

Sir Thomas Esmonde (*Wexford, N.*) 1017

Motion made and Question proposed, " That Item A (Salaries) be reduced by £100."—(*Sir Thomas Esmonde.*)

Page

The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.) 1022
Sir Thomas Esmonde 1024
Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.) 1024
Mr. Wyndham 1025

TIBET.

The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) .. 1025

And, it being after half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Resolution to be reported upon Monday next ; Committee also report Progress ; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

SUPPLY [16TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1904–5.—CLASS II.

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That a sum, not exceeding £14,371, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Officers of the Chief Secretary in Dublin and London, and of the Inspectors of Lunatic Asylums."

Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.) 1026

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That a sum, not exceeding £14,271, be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. Sloan.*)

Colonel Nolan (Galway, N.) 1209
Colonel Saunderson (Armagh, N.) 1030
Mr. Joseph Devlin (Kilkenny, N.) 1035
Mr. Charles Craig (Antrim, S.) 1039
Mr. Wyndham 1041
Mr. William Moore (Antrim, N.) 1044
Mr. John Redmond 1045
The Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury (Sir A. Acland-Hood, Somersetshire, Wellington) 1046

And, it being Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again upon Monday next.

County of Suffolk Bill.—Read a second time, and committed to a Select Committee of Seven Members, Three to be nominated by the House and Four by the Committee of Selection.

Ordered, That all Petitions against the Bill presented Five clear days before the meeting of the Committee be referred to the Committee; that the Petitioners praying to be heard by themselves, their Counsel, or Agents be heard against the Bill, and Counsel heard in support of the Bill.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.
Ordered, That Three be the Quorum.—(*Sir Cuthbert Quilter.*) . 1048

Adjourned at six minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: FRIDAY, 8TH JULY, 1904.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with :—

Rotherham Corporation ; Selby Urban District Council.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.. 1049

Strabane, Raphoe, and Convoy Railway Bill.—A witness ordered to attend the Select Committee 1049

Lytham Improvement Bill.—Reported, with Amendments 1049

Ulster Electric Power Bill [H.L.]—The Lord BALFOUR informed the House that the Promoters do not intend to proceed further with the Bill. The order of the 21st of April last discharged.

Ordered, That the Bill be not further proceeded with 1049

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill; Barnet District Gas and Water Bill. Leave given to the Select Committee to adjourn over Monday next 1049

North-Western Electricity and Power Gas Bill.—Read 3^{a}, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 1049

Southport and Lytham Tramroad (Extension of Time) Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 1049

Clyde Valley Electrical Power Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to 1049

Birkdale Improvement Bill; Crystal Palace District Gas Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 1049

Strabane, Raphoe, and Convoy Railway Bill.—Message to the Commons for the Right Honourable George Wyndham, Chief Secretary for Ireland (a Member), to be examined as a witness before the Select Committee of this House 1049

Hamilton Gas Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Tuesday next 1050

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.].—Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. Amendments reported (according to order), and Bills to be read 3^{a} on Monday next 1050

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.].—Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [H.L.]. Read 3^{a} (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 1050

Education Board Provisional Order (Cardiff) Bill.—House in Committee (according to order); Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3^{a} on Monday next 1050

Leith Corporation Tramways Order Confirmation Bill.—Brought from the Commons and read 1^{a}; to be printed; and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899), deemed to have been read 2^{a} (The Lord Kintore (*E. Kintore*), and reported from the Committee. (No. 137.) 1050

Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Provisional Order Bill.—Moved, That the order made on the 14th day of March last, "That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 16th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2^{a}; agreed to; Bill read 2^{a} accordingly and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Tuesday next .. 1050

Great Eastern Railway Bill.—Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3^{a}."—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

On Question, Bill read 3 .

The Lord President of the Council and President of the Board of Education (*The Marquess of Londonderry*) 1050

Amendment moved—

"That this clause be there inserted."—*The Marquess of Londonderry*).

The Acting Chairman of Committees (*Lord Balfour of Burleigh*) .. 1050

On Question, Amendment agreed to; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

PETITIONS.

Supply of Electricity Bill [H.L.].—Petition to be heard by Counsel against; of Association of County Councils in Scotland; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 1054

July 8.] Page

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

COLONIES (ANNUAL).—No. 419. Wei-hai-Wei (Report for 1903). 1054

JUDICIAL STATISTICS (IRELAND) 1903.—Part II. Civil Statistics 1054

SLAUGHTERING OF ANIMALS.—Report of the Committee appointed by the Admiralty to consider the humane slaughtering of animals; together with minutes of evidence, appendices, and index 1054

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3209. Brazil (Porto Allyre).

No. 3210. Portugal (Pete).

No. 3211. Portugal (Chinde).

No. 3212. Japan.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 1054

NEW BILL.

Public Health Bill [H.L.].—A Bill to enable regulations to be made for carrying into effect conventions with respect to the prevention of danger arising to public health from vessels, and the prevention of the conveyance of infection by means of vessels—Was presented by the Earl Waldegrave (for the Marquess of Landsdowne); read 1^a; to be printed; and to be read 2^a on Tuesday next. (No. 138.) 1054

Light Railways Bill [H.L.].—Read 3^a (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 1055

Hall-Marking of Foreign Plate Bill.—House in Committee (according to order); Bill reported without Amendment; and re-committed to the Standing Committee 1055

STAFF APPOINTMENTS.—

Lord Heneage 1055

Moved to resolve, "That, in the opinion of this House the present Army Regulations in regard to staff and extra-regimental duties, the non-seconding of officers above the rank of captain in the artillery and cavalry, and the retention of officers in successive appointments on the staff for unlimited periods limits the number of officers duly qualified for staff appointments, are most unfair to regimental officers, and are prejudicial to the best interests of the Army."—(*Lord Heneage.*)

Lord Lovat 1060
The Under Secretary of State for War (*The Earl of Donoughmore*) .. 1064
Lord Tweedmouth 1069

Motion, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

NAVAL INTERPRETERS.

Lord Ellenborough 1070
Viscount Sidmouth 1077
The First Lord of the Admiralty (The Earl of Selborne) 1077

THE DE MORLEY BARONY.

Lord Hawkesbury 1083
The Lord Chancellor (The Earl of Halsbury) 1083

House adjourned at twenty minutes past Six o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: FRIDAY, 8TH JULY, 1904.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz. :—Ilford Urban District Council Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time 1084

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE). —MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz. :—De Trafford Estate Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time 1085

Great Central Railway Bill.—London County Council (Money) Bill; Plymouth Corporation Bill; Wolverhampton Corporation Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 1085

Filey Improvement Bill [LORDS].—Maidenhead Bridge Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1085

Ebbw Vale Urban District Water Bill [LORDS].—Harrogate Waterworks Tramroad Bill [Lords]; Richard Jaeger's Patent Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time 1085

Airdrie Corporation Gas Order Confirmation Bill [LORDS].—Wishaw Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed without Amendment 1085

July 8.] *Page*

Arbroath Corporation Water Order Confirmation Bill.—Dunfermline District Water Order Confirmation Bill. Considered; to be read the third time upon Monday next 1085

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill.—As amended, considered; to be read the third time upon Monday next 1085

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill [LORDS].—Read a second time, and committed 1085

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill (BY ORDER).—As amended, considered; to be read the third time upon Monday next .. 1085

Railway Bills (Group No. 10.).—Sir LEWIS MCIVER reported from the Committee on Group No. 10 of Railway Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, they had adjourned until Tuesday next, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table 1085

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have agreed to—Soothill Nether Urban District Tramways Bill; Doncaster Corporation Bill; Skipton Water and Improvement Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to—Minehead Urban District Council Water Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend the Merchant Shipping Acts, 1894 to 1900." [Merchant Shipping Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, relating to Bath Rural District, Brynmawr, Chippenham, Eastleigh and Bishopstoke, Hanwell, Southgate Urban District, Tamworth, Walton-le-Dale, Watford, and Widnes (Amendment)." [Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, relating to Ashford (Kent), Ely, Ham, Hexham, Horley, Keynsham, (Somerset), Kingswood, Newton Abbot (Extension), Teignmouth (Amendment), and Walton-upon-Thames." [Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade, under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, relating to Clevedon, Portishead and Long Ashton, Crediton, Devizes, Hampton Wick and District, Houghton-le-Spring and District, the Maldens and Coombe, Northampton and District, Stroud, Nailsworth, and Dursley and Trowbridge (Urban), Bradford-on-Avon (Urban), and Bradford-on-Avon (Rural)." [Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade, under The Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, relating to Bognor Gas, Elham Valley Gas, Elstree and Boreham Wood Gas, Finedon Gas, and Godalming Gas." [Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [Lords].

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under The Gas and Waterworks Facilities Act, 1870, relating to Rainham Water, Sevenoaks Water, Southwold Water, Wetherby District Water, and Meldreth and Melbourn District Gas and Water." [Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords].

Strabane, Raphoe, and Convoy Railway Bill.—That they request that this House will be pleased to give leave to the right hon. George Wyndham, Chief Secretary for Ireland, a Member of this House, to attend, in order to his being examined as a Witness before the Select Committee appointed by their Lordships in the present Session of Parliament on the Strabane, Raphoe, and Convoy Railway Bill.

Lords Message, requesting the attendance of the right hon. George Wyndham, considered—

And, Mr. Wyndham, in his place, having consented, leave given 1086

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 260.] 1087

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 261.] 1087

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 262.] 1087

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 263.] 1087

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 264.] 1087

PETITIONS.

Alkali Works, etc., Bill.—Petition from Glasgow, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1088

Licensing Bill.—Petitions against; from Alston; Alvaston; Bentham; Bridgwater; Bristol (two); Burnley; Copmanthorpe; Creetland; Dairycoates; Denton; Dumfries; Eaton; Edenfield; Edinburgh; Exmouth; Fenton; Frisby; Garndiffaith; Garrigill; Gatehouse on Fleet; Great Dalby; Hadfield; Halton; Hornsey; Hull; Hungarton; Huntingdon; Isle of Wight; Lambeth; Lincoln (two); Linlithgow; Littletown; Llanidloes; Long Clawson; Marston; Merthyr Tydvil; Morpeth; Nenthead; Newcastle-on-Tyne; Ocker Hill; Oldbury; Oldham; Partick (two); Pendleton; Ponteband; Pontnewynydd; Rhyl (three); Rotherhithe; Seaford; Seaton Delaval; Sewstern; Sheffield (two); Sidmouth; Sowood; Sproxton; Stainland; Stockton-on-Tees; Teesdale; Thornaby-on-Tees; Thrussington; Waterhouses (two); West Vale; Wingate; and Wysall; to lie upon the Table 1088

July 8.] Page

LICENSING BILL.—Petition from Brighton, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 1088

TELEGRAPH (CONSTRUCTION) BILL.—Petition from Essex, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 1088

VALUATION BILL.—Petitions for alteration; from East Ashford; and Saddleworth; to lie upon the Table 1088

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

CRIMINAL AND JUDICIAL STATISTICS (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Criminal and Judicial Statistics of Ireland for the year 1903. Part II. Civil Statistics [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1089

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).—Copy presented, of Colonial Report, No. 388 Wei-hei-Wei), Annual Report for 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1089

IRON AND STEEL, 1901.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 6th July; *Mr. Gerald Balfour*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 244.] 1089

HUMANE SLAUGHTERING OF ANIMALS.—Copy presented, of Report of the Committee appointed by the Admiralty to consider the Humane Slaughtering of Animals together with Minutes of Evidence, Appendices, and Index [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1089

ALLOTMENTS (SCOTLAND).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 16th May; *Mr. Eugene Wason*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 245] 1089

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

USE OF SITE OF ENGLISH CEMETERY AT CORFU.—Question, Sir Henry Fowler (Wolverhampton, E.); Answer, Earl Percy 1089

POSITION OF POST OFFICE AT KILREA, COUNTY ANTRIM.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Lord Stanley 1090

QUALIFICATIONS FOR POST OFFICE ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT.—Question, Mr. Schwann (Manchester, N.); Answer, Lord Stanley 1090

VOLUNTEERS IN THE POSTAL TELEGRAPH SERVICE—LEAVE TO ATTEND ANNUAL INSPECTION.—Question, Captain Norton (Newington, W.); Answer, Lord Stanley 1091

ERECTION OF SMALL ARMS FACTORY IN INDIA.—Question, Mr. Bell (Derby); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1091

PENSION OF MR. J. C. NEESON, LATE CLERK OF BELFAST UNION.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1092

WAR TROPHIES—ALLEGED REFUSAL BY LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL.—Question, Mr. Whitmore (Chelsea); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1092

EPIZOOTIC LYMPHANGITIS AMONG ARMY HORSES.—Question, Mr. Hayes Fisher (Fulham); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1093

TRADING PRIVILEGES OF BRITISH INDIANS IN THE TRANSVAAL.—Question, Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree (Bethnal Green, N.E.) ; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton .. 1093

Labourers (Ireland) Bill.

The Chief Secretary for Ireland (*Mr. Wyndham, Dover*) 1094

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the Order [24th June] for Committee be read and discharged, and the Bill be committed to the Standing Committee on Trade, etc."—(*Mr. Wyndham.*)

Mr. William Moore (*Antrim, N.*) 1095
Mr. Charles Craig (*Antrim, S.*) 1099
Mr. T. W. Russell (*Tyrone, S.*) 1101

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 223 ; Noes, 10. (Division List No. 214.) ..

Irish Land Bill [SECOND READING].—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. John Redmond (*Waterford*) 1105
Captain Donelan (*Cork County, E.*) 1112

Amendment proposed—

" To leave out from the word, ' That ' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words, ' no measure dealing with the Amendment of the Irish Land Act of 1903 can be accepted as satisfactory which deals only with facilitating Irish landlords in obtaining the bonus, and which provides no remedy for the grave defects of that Act affecting Irish tenants, particularly the creation of a system of zones leading to the unjust inflation of prices, and the absence of provisions fo the compulsory acquisition of untenanted land essential for the enlargement of holdings, the restoration of evicted tenants, and the final settlement of the Irish land question ' instead thereof."—(*Mr. John Redmond.*)

Question proposed, " That the words propoesd to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. Flynn (*Cork County, N.*). 1115
Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (*Kerry, W.*) 1116
Mr. Lonsdale (*Armagh, Mid.*) 1119
Mr. Kilbride (*Kildare, S.*) 1122
Mr. T. W. Russell (*Tyrone, S.*) 1126
Mr. William Moore (*Antrim, N.*) 1130
The Chief Secretary for Ireland (*Mr. Wyndham, Dover*) 1131
Mr. T. M. Healy (*Louth, N.*) 1133

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 203 ; Noes, 90. (Division List No. 215.)

Main Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 199 ; Noes, 82. (Division List No. 216.)

Bill accordingly read a second time, and committed for Thursday next.

Savings Bank Acts Amendment Bill.—Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Amendment proposed [17th June] to the Bill on Consideration, as amended (by the Standing Committee).

Which Amendment was—

" In page 1, line 21, to leave out Clause 3."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Question again proposed, " That the words of the Clause to the end of line 24, page 1, stand part of the Bill."

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Other Amendments made to the Bill.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

The Licensing Bill.—

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury (*Sir A. Acland-Hood, Somersetshire, Wellington*) 1143

CHINESE COOLIES IN THE TRANSVAAL.

Mr. Swift MacNeill (*Donegal, S.*) 1143
The Secretary of State for the Colonies (*Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington*) 1144

Adjourned at four minutes before Six o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS: MONDAY, 11TH JULY, 1904.

CHARLES HENRY DUKE OF GORDON.—Was (in the usual manner) introduced by virtue of Letters Patent, dated the 13th day of January, 1876, his father, the Duke (Duke of Richmond in the Peerage of England), who was created by such Patent, never having taken his seat as Duke of Gordon 1145

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

London United Tramways Bill.—The King's consent signified ; and Bill reported, with Amendments 1145

Southport and Lytham Tramroad (Extension of Time) Bill [H.L.].—Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to 1145

Clyde Navigation (Works) Bill.—Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, the opposition thereto having been withdrawn ; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The orders made on Tuesday the 28th and Thursday the 30th of June last discharged, and Bill committed 1145

Swindon Corporation Bill.—Report from the Select Committee. That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, the opposition thereto having been withdrawn; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The orders made on Tuesday, the 28th and Thursday the 30th of June last discharged, and Bill committed for Thursday next 1145

City of London (Central Criminal Court House) Bill.—Read 3^a, and passed 1145

Charing Cross, Euston and Hampstead Railway Bill.—Read 3^a, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 1145

Savings Banks Acts Amendment Bill.—Brought from the Commons .. 1145

Loch Leven Water Power Bill.—Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; and referred to the Examiners 1145

Airdrie Corporation Gas Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Wishaw Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to 1146

Belfast and North-East Ireland Electricity and Power Gas Bill [H.L.]. —Reported, with Amendments 1146

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.].—Water Works Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. Read 3^a (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 1146

Education Board Provisional Order (Cardiff) Bill.—Read 3^a (according to order), and passed 1146

Filey Improvement Bill [H.L.].—Maidenhead Bridge Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with, Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to 1146

Great Central Railway Bill.—London County Council (Money) Bill; Plymouth Corporation Bill; Wolverhampton Corporation Bill. Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 1146

Strabane, Raphoe, and Convoy Railway Bill.—Message from the Commons giving leave to the right hon. George Wyndham, a Member, to attend the Select Committee (pursuant to message of Friday last) 1146

PETITIONS.

SUPPLY OF ELECTRICITY BILL [H.L.].—Petition to be heard by counsel against; of Corporation of Hackney; read, and ordered to lie upon the Table .. 1145

OUTDOOR RELIEF (FRIENDLY SOCIETIES) BILL [H.L.].—Petition against; of Guardians of the Poor of Bedford Union; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 1146

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION: ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (DEFECTIVE AND EPILEPTIC CHILDREN).—Regulations of the Board of Education, dated 11th July, 1904, providing for grants on account of the education of defective and epileptic children, and prescribing conditions to be fulfilled by certified schools and classes for such children 1147

July 11.]

Page

Africa, No. 8 (1904).—Correspondence relating to the resignation of Sir Charles Eliot and to the concession to the East Africa Syndicate 1147

Light Railways Act, 1896.—Orders made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade—

Authorising construction of light railways in the city of Ripon, and in the rural district of Ripon, in the West Riding of the county of York.

Authorising construction of a light railway from Witney, in the county of Oxford, to Andoversford, in the county of Gloucester.

Authorising construction of light railways in the county of Essex, in the borough of Southend-on-Sea, and the urban district of Shoeburyness.

Amending the Leek, Caldon, Low, and Hartington Light Railways Order, 1898.

Transferring to the mayor, aldermen, and burgesses of the borough of Lowestoft the powers conferred upon the East Anglian Light Railways Company by the East Anglian Light Railways Order, 1902, and amending that Order 1147

Whaling and Whale-Curing (Scotland).—Report of a Departmental Committee appointed by the Secretary for Scotland to inquire into the new whaling and whale-curing industry on the coast of Scotland, and in the adjacent waters. Volume II. Minutes of Evidence and Appendix.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 1147

Lunacy.—Appendix to Fifty-eight Report of the Commissioners in Lunacy, presented 29th June, 1904. 1147

Superannuation.—Treasury Minute, dated 7th July, 1904, declaring that Thomas Galler, skilled labourer, Royal Laboratory, War Office, was appointed without a Civil Service certificate through inadvertence on the part of the head of his Department 1147

Post Office (Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post).—Statutory Rules and Orders, 1904. No. 1076.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table .. 1148

Savings Banks Acts Amendment Bill.—Read 1^a; and to be printed. (No. 139.) 1148

Police Constable Anderson.

Earl Cadogan 1148

The Militia.

The Earl of Wemyss 1148

Moved to resolve, " That this House, while reaffirming the Resolution passed by the Lords in 1883, ' That having regard to the present defective military organisation, and to the great importance of the Militia Force, it is essential that the Militia should be forthwith recruited up to its established strength,' is further of opinion that so long as the Militia continues to be, as it now is, the constitutional basis of our existing military system, it should be so raised as not to compete for voluntary recruits, as it now does, with the Regular Army to the great detriment of the military forces of the Crown."—(*The Earl of Wemyss.*)

Lord Newton 1157
Viscount Hardinge 1161
Earl Bathurst 1164
Lord Rosmead 1165
The Under Secretary of State for War (*The Earl of Donoughmore*) 1166
Earl Spencer 1172
The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) 1175
The Earl of Wemyss 1178

On Question, their Lordships divided :—Contents, 21 ; Not-contents, 59.

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Seven o'clock till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: MONDAY, 11TH JULY, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz. :—

Buxton Urban District Council Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time 1181

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz. :—

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 3) Bill [Lords]; Scotch Education Department Provisional Order Confirmation (Edinburgh) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time To-morrow 1181

Barrow-in-Furness Corporation Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1181

Liverpool and Wigan Churches Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment 1181

July 11.] *Page*

Llanelly Harbour Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered ; a clause added ; Amendments made, ; Bill to be read the third time 1181

Loch Leven Water Power Bill.—As amended, considered. Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed. 1181

Tynemouth Corporation Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered ; to be read the third time 1182

Bridlington Corporation Bill [Lords] ; Bristol Tramways (Extensions) Bill [Lords] ; Lord Tredegar's Supplemental Estate Bill [Lords].—Read a second time, and committed 1182

Manchester Corporation (General Powers) Bill [Lords] ; Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [Lords] ; Scarisbrick Estate (Amendment) Bill [Lords].—Read a second time, and committed 1182

Arbroath Corporation Water Order Confirmation Bill ; Dunfermline District Water Order Confirmation Bill ; Glasgow Corporation (Police) Order Confirmation Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 1182

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill. Read the third time, and passed 1182

London Port and Docks Bill (by order).—Order for Second Reading read.

Lord Alwyne Compton (*Bedfordshire, Biggleswade*) 1182

Order discharged. Bill withdrawn.

Message from the Lords.—That they have agreed to—Great-Eastern Railway Bill ; North-Western Electricity and Power Gas Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to—Clyde Valley Electrical Power Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, " An Act to continue and amend The Light Railways Act, 1896." [The Light Railways Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill, intituled, " An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade, under The Tramways Act, 1870, relating to Altrincham Urban District Council Tramways, Calverley Urban District Council Tramways, Crompton Urban District Council Tramways, Plymouth Corporation Tramways, Rochdale Corporation Tramway, Royton Urban District Council Tramways, and Wardle Urban District Council Tramway." [Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [Lords.]

And, also, a Bill, intituled, " An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under The Gas and Waterworks Facilities Act, 1870, relating to Bradfield Water, Cholderton and District Water, Elham Valley Water, Frimley and Farnborough District Water, and North Sunderland Waterworks." [Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords.] 1183

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 265] 1184

Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 266] 1184

PETITIONS.

Licensing Bill.—Petitions against; from Aberkenfig; Aley Green; Atherstone; Attleborough (two); Barnes; Bedminster; Buckie; Burton on Trent; Chilvers Coton; Dawley; Desford; Drighlington; East Holywell; Edinburgh (four); Flitwick; Forest Hill; Frenchay; Gaddesden Row; Glasgow; Hartshill (two); Hawes; Hebron; Hoyland Common; Hoyland Nether; Ilford; Lowerhouse; Maidstone; Mickleover; Mylor; Newcastle-on Tyne; Notting Hill; Nuneaton (three); Peckham; Peckham Rye; Pentonville; Reading (four); Redcar; Richmond; Snape; Stalybridge; Studham; Thornaby on Tees; Totterdown; Ventnor; Wentworth; Wootton Wawen; and York; to lie upon the Table 1184

Sunday Trading (Scotland) Bill.—Petitions in favour; from the Royal, Parliamentary, and Police Burghs of Scotland; and Scottish Sabbath Protection Association; to lie upon the Table 1184

Valuation Bill.—Petition from Aberayron, for alteration, to lie upon the Table 1184

Voluntary Schools Act, 1897.—Petition from Rochester, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table 1184

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

County Courts (Plaints and Sittings).—Return presented, relative thereto [Address 30th June; *Mr. Cochrane*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 246.] 1184

Post Office (Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post).—Copy presented, of the Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 9) Warrant 1904, dated 21st June, 1904 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1185

Superannuation Act, 1884.—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 7th July, 1904, declaring that Thomas Galer, skilled labourer, Royal Laboratory, War Office, was appointed without a Civil Service certificate through inadvertence on the part of the head of his Department [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1185

Whaling and Whale-Curing (Scotland).—Copy presented, of Report of a Departmental Committee appointed by the Secretary for Scotland to inquire into the new Whale and Whale-curing Industry on the coast of Scotland and in the adjacent waters. Vol. II. Minutes of Evidence and Appendix [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1185

Board of Education.—Copy presented, of Regulations of the Board of Education, dated 11th July, 1904, providing for grants on account of the Education of Defective and Epileptic Children, and prescribing Conditions to be fulfilled by Certified Schools and Classes for such Children [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1185

July 11.] *Page*

AFRICA (No. 8, 1904).—Copy presented, of Correspondence relating to the Resignation of Sir Charles Eliot and to the Concession to the East Africa Syndicate [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1185

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copies presented of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3209 to 3212 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1185

FISHERIES (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Report of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland on the Sea and Inland Fisheries of Ireland for 1903. Part I. General Report [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1185

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, transferring to the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the borough of Lowestoft the powers conferred upon the East Anglian Light Railways Company by The East Anglian Light Railways Order, 1902, and amending that Order (Lowestoft Corporation (East Anglian Transfer) Light Railways Order, 1904) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1186

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways in the city of Ripon and in the rural district of Ripon, in the West Riding of the county of York (Ripon and District Light Railways Order, 1904) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1186

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.—Copy presented of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade amending the Leek, Caldon Low, and Hartington Light Railways Order, 1898 (Leek, Caldon Low, and Hartington Light Railways (Extension of time, etc.) Order, 1904) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1186

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of a Light Railway from Witney, in the county of Oxford, to Andoversford, in the county of Glou'ester (Witney, Burford, and Andoversford, Light Railway Order, 1904) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 1186

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways in the county of Essex, in the borough of Southend-on-Sea and the urban district of Shoeburyness (Southend-on-Sea and District Light Railways (Extension) Order, 190.) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1186

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.—Lunacy. Copy of Appendix to the fifty-eighth Report of the Commissioners in Lunacy to the Lord Chancellor [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 247.] 1187

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT REGULATIONS.—Question, Mr. Yoxall (Nottingham, W.); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 1187

RETURN OF PARISH CHARITIES (SCOTLAND).—Question, Mr. Haldane (Haddingtonshire); Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 1187

July 11.]

Page

TEACHING OF HYGIENE IN SCOTCH SCHOOLS.—Question, Sir John Leng (Dundee); Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 1188

INCREASE IN NUMBER OF AGED POOR IN POORHOUSES IN SCOTLAND.—Question, Mr. Black (Banffshire); Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 1188

MEAL RELIEFS IN THE GENERAL POST OFFICE.—Question, Sir Walter Foster (Derbyshire, Ilkeston); Answer, Lord Stanley 1189

STRUCTURAL ALTERATIONS AT ROSCREA POST OFFICE—CLAIM OF MR. ACRES.—Question, Mr. Kendal O'Brien (Tipperary, Mid.); Answer, Lord Stanley .. 1189

PROMOTION OF A LEARNER IN PORTADOWN POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Wood (Down, E.); Answer, Lord Stanley 1190

TEACHING OF HYGIENE IN SCHOOLS.—Question, Sir John Leng; Answer, Sir William Anson 1190

STATUS AND PAY OF NAVAL SCHOOLMASTERS.—Question, Mr. Yoxall; Answer, Mr. Pretyman 1191

SUBSTITUTION OF SCHOOLS FOR TRAINING SHIPS.—Question, Mr. Reginald Lucas (Portsmouth); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 1191

CHINESE LABOUR IN THE TRANSVAAL—PROHIBITION BY THE CHINESE AUTHORITIES AT CANTON.—Question, Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1192

POWERS GRANTED FOR ELECTRIC SUPPLY TO DISTRICTS, RETURN.—Question, Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour .. 1192

INFANTILE MORTALITY.—Question, Sir Walter Foster; Answer, Mr. Walter Long.. 1192

POSITION OF DEBENTURE HOLDERS OF IRISH LOAN FUND BANKS.—Question, Dr. Thompson (Monaghan, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1193

THE IRISH ESTATES COMMISSIONERS.—Question, Dr. Thompson; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1193

IRISH POOR LAW OFFICER'S SUPERANNUATION BILL.—Question, Dr. Thompson; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1194

ERECTION OF LABOURER'S COTTAGE FOR WILLIAM CARROLL IN THE CASHEL RURAL DISTRICT.—Question, Mr. Condon (Tipperary, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1194

THE SHERLOCK ESTATE, COUNTY CORK.—Question, Captain Donelan (Cork, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1196

MANUFACTURE OF RIFLES IN GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE FACTORIES.—Question, Mr. Shackleton (Lancashire, Clitheroe); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1196

OFFICERS WARNED FOR REMOVAL FROM SALISBURY.—Question, Sir Walter Palmer (Salisbury); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1197

July 11.] *Page*

PROMOTION IN THE ROYAL ARMY MEDICAL CORPS.—Question, Dr. Thompson; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1197

TENDERS FOR MEAT FOR BALLYKINLOR CAMP.—Question, Mr. Wood; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1198

DISTURBANCES AMONGST CHINESE LABOURERS AT TIENTSIN.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1198

SALARIES AND FEES OF LAW OFFICERS OF THE CROWN—OPPORTUNITY FOR DISCUSSION.—Question, Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1199

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

H.M.S. "CENTURION"—DEFECTIVE GUN SIGHTS.—Questions, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answers, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge) 1199

H.M.S. "PRINCE OF WALES"—SIGHT FITTINGS.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, Mr. Pretyman 1200

ALTERATION ON SHIPS OF WAR—KING'S REGULATIONS.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, Mr. Pretyman 1201

TRANSVAAL LABOUR ORDINANCE.—Question, Mr. Markham (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington) 1201

THE CHINESE EXCLUSION BILL IN CAPE COLONY.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1202

DESERTIONS FROM THE COOLIE CAMP IN JOHANNESBURG.—Questions, Mr. Swift MacNeill and Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland); Answers, Mr. Lyttelton 1202

GREAT BRITAIN AND TIBET—CHINESE RIGHTS.—Question, Mr. Labouchere (Northampton); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 1203

ASSISTANT MILITARY SECRETARY FOR INDIAN AFFAIRS.—Question, Captain Norton (Newington, W.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1204

REGENT OF ZANZIBAR.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 1204

STOPPAGE OF BRITISH MAIL STEAMERS BY RUSSIAN WARSHIPS.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Earl Percy 1204

RULE OF THE ROAD AT SEA—BOARD OF TRADE WARNING.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) 1205

STONY STRATFORD POSTMASTERSHIP—WAR SERVICES REWARDED.—Questions, Mr. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green); Answers, The Postmaster-General (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 1206

Report of Chief Inspector of Factories and Workshops.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Cochrane, Ayrshire, N.) 1206

Alien Pauper Lunatics and Convicts.—Question, Sir Walter Greene (Bury St. Edmunds); Answer, Mr. Cochrane 1207

Agricultural Profits in Great Britain.—Question, Mr. Eugene Wason (Clackmannan and Kinross); Answer, Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes (Huntingdonshire, Ramsay) 1207

Ordnance Survey Department, Discipline.—Question, Mr. Nannetti; Answer, Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes 1208

Admiralty Courtyard, Whitehall.—Question, General Laurie (Pembroke and Haverfordwest); Answer, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley) .. 1208

Rathmines Register.—Question, Mr. Mooney (Dublin County, S.); Answer, The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) .. 1209

Kingstown and Dalkey Voters Lists.—Question, Mr. Mooney; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1209

Transfer of Powers from Irish Harbour Authorities to County Councils.—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde (Wexford, N.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 1210

Fisheries on South East Coast of Ireland.—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1210

Dr. Starkie and Irish Intermediate Schools.—Question, Mr. Joseph Devlin (Kilkenny, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1210

Derrygoolan Shooting Rights.—Questions, Mr. Kilbride (Kildare, S.) and Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 1211

Moy Nationalist Demonstration.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh (Dover, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1212

Irish Land Purchase—Granville Knox Estate, County Mayo.—Question, Mr. O'Dowd (Sligo, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1212

Labourers Acts—Cost of Providing Additional Lands.—Question, Mr. O'Shee (Waterford, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1213

Evicted Tenants in County Galway.—Question, Mr. Kilbride; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1214

Warren's Court Estate, County Cork.—Question, Mr. Sheehan (Cork County, Mid); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1214

alters Company's Trust in Magherafelt.—Question, Mr. Joseph Devlin; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1215

Wicklow Canteen Licence—Action of Mr. Shanks.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1215

July 11.] *Page*

PROSELYTISING PRACTICES IN KINSALE.—COMPLAINT AGAINST COMMANDER SALWEY.—Question, Mr. Crean (Cork County, S.E.) ; Answer, Mr. Pretyman 1215

PHŒNIX PARK, DUBLIN—TRADERS' VANS.—Question, Mr. Clancy (Dublin County, N.) ; Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.) 1216

HARCOURT ROAD, DUBLIN—SUB-POSTMASTER'S SALARY.—Question, Mr. Nannetti ; Answer, Lord Stanley 1216

THE CUT, MOUNTMELLICK, QUEEN'S COUNTY.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory) ; Answer, The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Mr. Bromley-Davenport, Cheshire, Macclesfield) 1217

LONGFORD INFIRMARY COMMITTEE AND MILITARY PATIENTS.—Question, Sir Carne Rasch (Essex, Chelmsford) ; Answer, Mr. Bromley Davenport .. 1217

THE STATE AND THE UNEMPLOYED.—Questions, Mr. Crooks (Woolwich), Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield Central), and Mr. Flavin ; Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1218

THAMES BARRAGE SCHEME AND NATIONAL FORESHORE RECLAMATION.—Question, Mr. Crooks ; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1219

THE COALING OF BELLIGERENT WARSHIPS AT ENGLISH COALING STATIONS.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles ; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1219

THE LICENSING BILL.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason ; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1220

THE ALIENS BILL.—Questions, Mr. Forde Ridley (Bethnal Green, S.W.) and Major Evans Gordon (Tower Hamlets, Stepney) 1220

REDISTRIBUTION BILL.—Question, Sir Walter Green ; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1221

THE PORT OF LONDON BILL.—Questions, Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe) ; Mr. Peel (Manchester, S.), Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar), and Mr. Lough (Islington, W.) ; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour .. 1222

THE LICENSING BILL—CLAUSES 3 AND 4.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles ; Answer, Mr. Speaker 1223

COLONIAL OFFICE VOTE.—Questions, Mr. John Ellis and Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs) ; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1223

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Question, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman ; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1224

NEW MEMBER SWORN.—George Charles Bingham, Esquire, commonly called Lord Bingham, for the County of Surrey (North Western or Chertsey Division) 1224

MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY ACT (1882) AMENDMENT BILL [LORDS].—Read the first time ; to be read a second time upon Thursday, and to be printed [Bill 267] 1224

Page

NEW BILL.

Post Office Bill.—" To amend the Post Office Acts with respect to cumulative commissions on money orders and the use of embossed and impressed stamps," presented by Lord Stanley; to be read a second time upon Thursday, and to be printed. [Bill 268.] 1224

Licensing Bill [2ND ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 2 :—

Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee) 1224

Amendment proposed—

" In page 1, line 27, at the beginning, to insert the words ' In the case of premises having an annual value, taken as for the purposes of the publican's licence duty, under fifty pounds.' "—(*Mr. Edmund Robertson.*)

Question proposed, " That those words be there inserted."

The Solicitor-General (Sir Edward Carson, Dublin University) .. 1126

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 133 ; Noes, 254. (Division List No. 217.)

Sir William Houldsworth (Manchester, N.W.) 1229

Amendment proposed—

" In page 1, line 27, after the word ' Where,' to insert the words ' within fourteen years after the passing of this Act. ' "—(*Sir William Houldsworth.*)

Question proposed, " That those words be there inserted."

Sir Robert Reid (Dumfries Burghs) 1235
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1239
Mr. Whittaker (Yorkshire, W.R., Spen Valley) 1244
Sir John Gorst (Cambridge University) 1248
Sir Edward Grey (Northumberland, Berwick) 1252
Mr. Cripps (Lancashire, Stretford) 1254
Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) 1256
Mr. Henry Hobhouse (Somersetshire, E.) 1257
Mr. Tomkinson (Cheshire, Crewe) 1259
Sir Edward Carson 1260
Mr. Markham (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield) 1261

Question put.

Page

July 11.]

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 209 ; Noes, 250. (Division List No. 218.)

Mr. Black (*Banffshire*) 1265

Amendment proposed—

" In page 1, line 28, after the word ' Act,' to insert the words ' or where licensed premises are required for purposes of public utility or improvement. ' "—(*Mr. Black.*)

Question proposed, " That those words be there inserted."

The Secretary of State for the Home Department (*Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's*) 1266

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Mr. Seely (*Lincoln*) 1278

Amendment proposed—

" In page 1, line 28, to leave out from the word ' Act ' to the end of Subsection (1), and insert the words ' the following sums shall be paid as compensation to the persons concerned.

' (*a*) To all persons employed in or about the licensed premises in connection with the sale of intoxicating liquors, three months wages or salary.

' (*b*) To the occupier of the said premises, a sum equal to two years profits calculated on the average of the last five years, and also the difference between the value of the stock and fittings in the premises, as valued between an ingoing and outgoing tenant and their value for removal and sale.

' (*c*) To the owner of the said premises, the cost of any structural alterations necessary to adapt the premises to other uses than the sale of intoxicating liquors, such amount not to exceed two years annual value.

' (*d*) If the renewal be refused before the thirty-first day of December, 1914, then there shall be paid in addition to compensation as above to the owner of the said premises a sum equal to the average annual profits calculated as above multiplied by the number of years unexpired between the date of the refusal of the licence and the thirty-first of December, 1914.' "—(*Mr. Seely.*)

Question proposed, " That the words ' a sum ' stand part of the clause."

Sir Edward Carson 1271
Mr. Asquith (*Fifeshire, E.*) 1271
Sir Edward Carson 1273
Mr. J. H. Lewis (*Flint Boroughs*) 1276

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again this evening.

July 11.]

Page

EVENING SITTING.

Licensing Bill [2ND ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 2 :—

Amendment again proposed—

"In page 1, line 28, to leave out from the word 'Act,' to the end of Sub-section (1), and insert the words 'the following sums shall be paid as compensation to the person concerned :—

'(*a*) To all persons employed in or about the licensed premises in connection with the sale of intoxicating liquors, three months wages or salary.

'(*b*) To the occupier of the said premises, a sum equal to two years profits calculated on the average of the last five years, and also the difference between the value of the stock and fittings in the premises, as valued between an ingoing and outgoing tenant and their value for removal and sale.

" '(*c*) To the owner of the said premises, the cost of any structural alterations necessary to adapt the premises to other uses than the sale of intoxicating liquors, such amount not to exceed two years annual value.

" '(*d*) If the renewal be refused before the thirty-first day of December, one thousand nine hundred and fourteen, then there shall be paid in addition to compensation as above to the owner of the said premises a sum equal to the average annual profits, calculated as above multiplied by the number of years unexpired between the date of the refusal of the licence and the thirty-first day of December one thousand nine hundred and fourteen.' "—(*Mr. Seely.*)

Question again proposed, "That the words 'a sum' stand part of the clause."

Mr. Edwards (*Radnor*) 1279
Dr. Macnamara (*Camberwell, N.*) 1281
Mr. J. A. Pease (*Essex, Saffron Walden*) 1282
Mr. Bousfield (*Hackney, N.*) 1283
Mr. Robson (*South Shields*) 1284
Mr. Crooks (*Woolwich*) 1286
Mr. Samuel Evans (*Glamorganshire, Mid.*) 1288
Lord Willoughby de Eresby (*Lincolnshire, Horncastle*) 1289
Sir Robert Reid (*Dumfries Burghs*) 1290
Mr. Seely 1291
Mr. Rea (*Gloucester*) 1292
Mr. Emmott (*Oldham*) 1293
Sir Edward Carson 1294
Mr. Lloyd-George 1298

July 11.]

And, it being Eleven of the Clock, the CHAIRMAN proceeded, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 5th July, to put the Question on the Amendment already proposed from the Chair.

Question put, " That the words ' a sum ' stand part of the clause.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 285 ; Noes, 181. (Division List No. 219.)

Mr. Lloyd-George 1303

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 2, line 4, to leave out the words 'in default of agreement,' and insert the words 'if an amount is agreed upon by the persons appearing to quarter sessions to be interested in the licensed premises and is approved by quarter sessions, be that amount, and in default of such agreement and approval shall.' "—(*Mr. Secretary Akers Douglas.*)

Question, " That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

> " In page 2, line 8, after the word ' premises,' to insert the words, ' including the holder of the license.' "—(*Mr. Secretary Akers Douglas.*)

Question, " That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

> " In page 2, line 9, to leave out from the word ' be,' to the word ' determined,' in line 10."—(*Mr. Secretary Akers Douglas.*)

Question, " That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

> " In page 2, line 10, at the end, to insert the words ' having regard in the case of the licence-holder not only to his legal interest in the premises but also to his conduct and to the length of time during which he has been the holder of the licence, and the holder of a licence shall (notwithstanding any agreement to the contrary) in no case receive a less amount than he would be entitled to as tenant for a year, or from year to year, of the licensed premises." '—(*Mr. Secretary Akers Douglas.*)

Question, " That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Question put, ' That the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 280 ; Noes, 174. (Division List No. 220.)

Clause 3 :—

Amendment proposed—

> " In page 2, line 11, to leave out the word ' may,' and insert the words ' shall in each year, unless they certify to the Secretary of State that it is unnecessary to do so in any year.' "—(*Mr. Secretary Akers Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 12, after the word 'all,' to insert the word 'existing.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers Douglas.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 280 ; Noes, 156. (Division List No. 221.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 13, to leave out the words 'granted or.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 16, at the beginning, to insert the word 'First.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 24, to leave out Sub-section (3), and insert the words, '(3) Such deductions from rent as are set out in the Second Schedule to this Act may, notwithstanding any agreement to the contrary, be made by any licence-holder who pays a charge under this section, and also by any person from whose rent a deduction is made in respect of the payment of such a charge.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, lines 33 and 34, to leave out the words 'or in respect of special payments for new licences.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.]

Another Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 41, after the word 'Act' to insert the words 'and such expenses of the justices of the licensing district incurred under this Act as quarter sessions may allow."'—(*Mr. Secretary Akers Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Another Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 7, at the end, to add the words 'Quarter sessions shall in each year make such returns to the Secretary of State with respect to their own action, and that of the justices of licensing districts, under this Act, as the Secretary of State may require.'"—(*Mr. Solicitor-General.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Question put, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 266 ; Noes, 160. (Division List No. 222.)

And, it being after Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again to-morrow.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the House do now adjourn."—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*)

Mr. Swift MacNeill (*Donegal S.*) 1321
Mr. Herbert Samuel (*Yorkshire, Cleveland*) 1323
The Secretary of State for the Colonies (*Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington*) 1323
Mr. H. J. Wilson (*Yorkshire, W.R., Holmfirth*) 1324
Mr. Flavin (*Kerry, N.*) 1324
Mr. Cremer (*Shoreditch, Haggerston*) 1324

Question put, and agreed to.

INDIAN ARMY UNIFORMS.—Address for "Return of all changes in the regulations affecting the dress and equipment of officers in the Indian Army since November, 1902, showing, where possible, the approximate cost of the changes in each rank to the officers concerned."—(*Sir Seymour King.*) .. 1324

County of Suffolk Bill.—Mr. Stuart-Wortley, Sir Cuthbert Quilter, and Mr. Goddard were nominated members of the Select Committee on the County of Suffolk Bill.—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood*) 1324

Adjourned at twenty minutes before One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: TUESDAY, 12TH JULY, 1904.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Rotherham Corporation Bill.—Moved, That the Order made on the 14th day of March last, "That no Prviate Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 16th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2ª ; agreed to ; Bill read 2ª accordingly and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 1325

Liverpool and Wigan Churches Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to 1325

Barrow-in-Furness Corporation Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 1325

Torquay Tramways Bill.—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 1325

July 12.]

Page

Arbroath Corporation Water Order Confirmation Bill (No. 140); Dunfermline District Water Order Confirmation Bill (No. 141); Glasgow Corporation (Police) Order Confirmation Bill (No. 142). Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; to be printed; and pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act (1899), deemed to have been read 2 (The Lord Kintore (*E. Kintore*)), and reported from the Committee 1325

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill (No. 143); Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill (No. 144).—Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners 1325

Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Provisional Order Bill; Hamilton Gas Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. House in Committee according to order); Bills reported without amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be read 3ª on Thursday next 1325

PETITIONS.

SUPPLY OF ELECTRICITY BILL [H.L.].—Petition to be heard by counsel against; of the County Council of Lanarkshire; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 1326

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

INDIA (ACCOUNTS AND ESTIMATES, 1904–1905).—Explanatory memorandum by the Secretary of State for India 1326

FISHERIES (IRELAND).—Report of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland on the sea and coast fisheries of Ireland, for the year 1903. Part I. General Report 1326

REFORMATORY AND INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS (GREAT BRITAIN).—Forty-seventh Report, for the year 1903, of the Inspector of Reformatory and Industrial Schools. Part I. List of Schools and detailed reports.

Presented [by Command], and ordered to lie on the Table 1326

PENAL SERVITUDE ACT, 1891.—Regulation made by the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland for taking finger-prints, etc., of untried prisoners 1326

SEA FISHERIES REGULATION ACT, 1888.—Order made by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries, under the provisions of the above Act, for the variation of the Order creating the North-Eastern Sea Fisheries District 1326

PRISONS (ENGLAND AND WALES) (VISITING COMMITTEES).—Draft rules proposed to be made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, under the Prison Acts, 1877 and 1898, with respect to the constitution of the Visiting Committee of Borstal Prison.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table .. 1326

Hall-marking of Foreign Plate Bill.—Reported from the Standing Committee, without Amendment; and to be read 3ª on Thursday next 1327

THE PROTECTION OF THE BRITISH FLAG.

Lord Muskerry 1327
The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) .. 1327

July 12.] *Page*

Registration of Clubs (Ireland) Bill. [Second Reading].—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Clonbrock 1327

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Clonbrock.*)

The Earl of Denbigh 1329

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Friday next.

CROWN AGENTS AND SHIPPING RATES.

The Earl of Portsmouth 1329
The Under Secretary of State for the Colonies (*The Duke of Marlborough*) 1331
Earl Grey 1338

EDUCATION GRANTS.

Earl Bathurst 1339
The Lord President of the Council and President of the Board of Education (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) 1340

THE CASE OF CONSTABLE ANDERSON.

Earl Cadogan 1342
The Lord Chancellor of Ireland (*Lord Ashbourne*) 1343
Earl Spencer 1344
The Marquess of Lansdowne 1345

House adjourned at half-past Five o'clock, to Thursday next, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: TUESDAY, 12TH JULY, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS [LORDS (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.:—Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time to-morrow 1346

Doncaster Corporation Bill.—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 1346

Richard Jaeger's Patent Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1346

Caledonian Railway Order Confirmation Bill [LORDS].—Glasgow and South Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill [Lords]; Govan Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [Lords]. Read a second time; to be considered upon Thursday 1346

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 3) Bill [LORDS].—Scotch Education Department Provisional Order Confirmation (Edinburgh) Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed 1346

Great Western Railway Bill [LORDS].—Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynaman Railway Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1346

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP No. 10).—Sir LEWIS McIVER reported from the Committee on Group No. 10 of Railway Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, they had adjourned until Tuesday next, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table 1347

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have agreed to—Educational Board Provisional Order (Cardiff) Bill; City of London (Central Criminal Court-House) Bill, without Amendment.

Charing Cross, Euston, and Hampstead Railway, Bill with Amendments.

Amendments to—Southport and Lyntham Tramroad (Extension of Time) Bill [Lords]; Filey Improvement Bill [Lords]; Maidenhead Bridge Bill [Lords], without Amendment 1347

PETITIONS.

BISHOPRICS OF SOUTHWARK AND BIRMINGHAM BILL.—Petition from Birmingham, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1347

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Kintyre, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 1347

LICENSING BILL.—Petitions against; from Allestree; Armley; Aston on Trent; Barrow on Soar; Borrowash; Boughton; Boxted; Bradford; Bramley; Brierfield, Bucknall; Callow; Camberwell; Castle Donington; Colby; Colne (two); Costock; Derby; Dewsbury (two); Dunstan; East Leake; Elmstead; Foubridge; Gateshead (four); Great Bedwyn; Hackney; Haltwhistle; Hastings; Hebburn; Helpringham; Hemingfield; Hexham; Hither Green; Holbeck (two); Hoton; Ilford; Kilburn; King's Heath; Leysters; Loughborough; Low Wortley; Madeley; Mark's Tey; Mawbrey; Mount Sorrel; Newcastle on Tyne (three); New Wortley; Norwich; Peldon; Pewsey; Preston; Quarndon; Queen's Ferry; Rocksholme; Sabden; Silver Royd Hill; South Bank; Stamford Hill; Thornton; Warrington; West Mersea; Willoughby; Wimborne; Wivenhoe; Wymeswold; and York; to lie upon the Table 1347

Licensing Bill.—Petitions for alteration; from Hastings; and South Kensington; to lie upon the Table 1348

Local Authorities Officers Superannuation Bill.—Petition from Camberwell, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1348

Valuation Bill.—Petition from Nuneaton, against; to lie upon the Table .. 1348

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Reformatory and Industrial Schools (Great Britain).—Copy presented, of Forty-Seventh Report of His Majesty's Inspector of Reformatory and Industrial Schools for 1903. Part I. List of Schools and Detailed Reports [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1348

Prisons (England and Wales).—Copy presented, of draft Rules proposed to be made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department under the Prisons Acts, 1877 and 1898, with respect to the constitution of the Visiting Committee of Borstal Prison [by Act]; to lie upon the Table .. 1348

Penal Servitude Act, 1891.—Copy presented, of Regulations made by the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland for taking Finger Prints, etc., of Untried Prisoners [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1348

East India (Accounts and Estimates, 1904–5).—Copy presented, of Explanatory Memorandum by the Secretary of State for India [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1348

Sea Fisheries Regulation Act, 1888.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries, under the provisions of the Act for the variation of the Order creating the North-Eastern Sea Fisheries District [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1348

Trade Reports (Annual Series).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports Annual Series, Nos. 3213 to 3215 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1349

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill.—Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Order included in the Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill."—(*Mr. Bonar Law.*) 1349

Electric Power Undertakings.—Return ordered, "showing the names of companies or persons who have obtained Acts conveying powers for the supply of Electric Power to Districts, with the names and areas of such Districts and the year in which the powers were obtained, and whether such powers have been exercised or not; and, in the former case, what is the state of the works constructed under such powers."—(*Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) .. 1349

Prosecution of Offences Act, 1879 and 1884.—Address for Return showing the working of the Regulations made in 1886 for carrying out the Prosecution of Offences Acts, 1879 and 1884, with Statistics setting forth the number, nature, result, and cost of the Proceedings instituted by the Director in accordance with those Regulations, from the 1st day of January, 1903, to the 31st day of December, 1903 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 209, of Session 1903)."—(*Mr. Cochrane*) 1349

July 12.]

Page

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Religious Examinations in Schools—Permission of the Local Authority.—Question, Mr. Soames (Norfolk, S.); Answer, Sir William Anson 1349

Obstruction of Main Street in Omagh by Farming Machines.—Question, Dr. Thompson (Monaghan, N.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1350

Outstanding Exchequer Bonds and Treasury Bills.—Question, Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1351

State of Affairs in the Aden Hinterland.—Question, Sir Walter Foster (Derbyshire, Ilkeston); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1351

Members of Royal Irish Constabulary Punished at Instance of County Inspector Ball.—Question, Mr. P. A. McHugh (Leitrim, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1351

Sanitary Condition of Irish Workhouses.—Question, Dr. Thomson; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1352

Sanitary Condition of Glenties Workhouse.—Question, Dr. Thompson; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1352

Pensions for Junior Literary Assistants of the Irish National Education Commissioners.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty (Donegal, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1353

Assistant Teachers in Irish National Schools.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (Kerry, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1353

Whisky for the Inmates of the Naas Union—Refund of Duty.—Question, Mr. Leamy (Kildare, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1355

Gold output of Transvaal Mines—White and Native Labour.—Question, Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1356

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Maltese Finance.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington) .. 1357

Prosecution of Fortune Tellers.—Question, Mr. John Campbell (Armagh, S.); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's).. 1357

The Alleged Mutiny on Board S.S. "Homewood"—Composition of the Crew.—Questions, Mr. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green); Answers, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) .. 1357

Tuberculosis By-Laws.—Question, Mr. Lundon (Limerick, E.); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.) 1358

Inspection of Meat.—Questions, Mr. Lundon and Mr. Kilbride (Kildare, S.); Answers, Mr. Walter Long 1359

July 12.] *Page*

KILRUSHEIGHTEY SCHOOL TEACHER'S SALARY.—Questions, Mr. P. A. M'Hugh, Leitrim, N.); Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 1360

IRISH INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION—COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY.—Question, Mr. Flynn (Cork County, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1362

QUEEN'S COLLEGE (BELFAST) PROFESSORS.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1362

IRISH QUEEN'S COLLEGES.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1363

LECTURES IN QUEEN'S COLLEGE, BELFAST.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1363

WESTROPP ESTATE, COUNTY CLARE.—Questions, Mr. Sheehy (Meath, S.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 1363

GLEN (KERRY) BOAT-SLIP.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, Mr. Wyndham .. 1364

KANTURK LAND APPEALS.—Question, Mr. Flynn; Answer, Mr. Wyndham .. 1365

STRABANE LABOURERS' COTTAGE SCHEME.—Question, Mr. M'Fadden (Donegal, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1365

RAE ESTATE, KERRY.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1366

IRISH LANGUAGE FOR IRISH POSTAL OFFICIALS.—Questions, Mr. Boland; Answers, The Postmaster General (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 1366

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Questions, Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar), Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee), and Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe); Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1367

NEW WRIT.—New Writ for the County of Salop (Western or Oswestry Division), in the room of the Hon. George Ralph Charles Ormsby-Gore, now Baron Harlech, called up to the House of Peers —(*Sir A. Acland-Hood*) 1368

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Mr. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Members from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Shipping), Shipping, and Manufactures; Dr. MacDonnell, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Runciman, Mr. Channing, and Mr. William McKillop; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Clancy, Mr. O'Shee, Mr. Lundon, Mr. Joseph Nolan, and Mr. McHugh.

Report to lie upon the Table 1368

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Mr. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had added to the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures, the following fifteen Members in respect of the Labourers (Ireland) Bill: Mr. Moore, Mr. Charles Craig, Mr. O'Doherty, Dr. Thompson, Mr. Joseph Devlin, Mr. Hayden, Mr. O'Shaughnessy, Mr. Kilbride, Mr. Cullinan, Captain Donelan, Mr. Sheehan, Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. Sloan, Mr. Corbett, and Mr. O'Neill.

Report to lie upon the Table 1368

NEW BILLS.

Isle of Man (Customs) Bill.—" To amend the Law with respect to Customs Duties in the Isle of Man," presented by Mr. Victor Cavendish ; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 269) 1368

Criminal Aliens Bill.—" To make provision for the repatriation of Criminal Aliens," presented by Sir Howard Vincent ; supported by Mr. Forde Ridley, Sir Carne Rasch, Sir Ernest Flower, Mr. Runciman, Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. Herbert Robertson, and Colonel Pilkington ; to be read a second time upon Friday, and to be printed. [Bill 270]. 1369

Licensing Bill [Third Allotted Day].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. Lowther (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 4 :—

The Secretary of State for the Home Department (*Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's*) 1369

Amendment proposed—

" In page 3, line 8, to leave out from the word ' of ' to the word ' be,' in line 10, and to insert the words, ' the county licensing committee to confirm new licences, and any other power of that committee shall.' "—(*Mr. Secretary Akers Douglas.*)

Question proposed, " That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. Helme (*Lancashire, Lancaster*) 1371
Mr. Lloyd Wharton (*Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon*) 1371
Mr. Lloyd-George (*Carnarvon Boroughs*) 1371

Question put and negatived.

Words inserted.

Mr. Henry Hobhouse 1372

Amendment proposed—

" In page 3, line 11, after the word ' sessions ' to insert the words ' and shall include the power to sanction any conditions attached to a new licence under the provisions of this section.' "—(*Mr. Henry Hobhouse.*)

Question proposed, " That those words be there inserted."

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (*Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.*) 1373
Sir Robert Reid (*Dumfries Burghs*) 1374

July 12.] Page

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Whittaker (*Yorkshire, W.R., Spen Valley*) 1374

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 8, at beginning, to insert the words 'No new licences shall be granted before the 1st day of January, 1907, and after that date.'"—(*Mr. Whittaker.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Colonel Pilkington (*Lancashire, Newton*) 1375
Mr. Akers Douglas 1375
Mr. Broadhurst (*Leicester*) 1376

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 11, to leave out from the word 'sessions' to end of sub-section."—(*Mr. Secretary Akers Douglas.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Whittaker 1376

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 11, at end, to insert the words '(1) No application for a new licence shall be received or considered by the justices of a licensing district unless and until they have issued a public notice that in their opinion a new licence is required in a particular locality and they are prepared to receive applications for it.'"—(*Mr. Whittaker.*)

Question proposed "That those words be there inserted."

The Solicitor-General (*Sir Edward Carson, Dublin University*) 1377
Mr. Channing (*Northamptonshire, E.*) 1378

Question put and negatived.

Sir Edward Grey (*Northumberland, Berwick*) 1378

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 13, at end, to insert the words 'provided that a local authority may, by resolution, declare that no new on-licence shall be so granted or confirmed in respect of premises within their area except to a company or association of persons formed for the purpose of devoting any profits (or any such proportion of profits as may be specified in the resolution) to public purposes and complying with regulations made for the purpose by the Secretary of State, and any such resolution shall have effect accordingly.'"—(*Sir Edward Grey.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. A. J. Balfour 1381
Mr. Lloyd-George 1384
Mr. Hunt (*Shropshire, Ludlow*) 1385

Sir Robert Reid 1386
Sir Edward Carson 1387
Mr. Asquith (Fifeshire, E.) 1388
Mr. Talbot (Oxford University) 1389
Mr. Samuel Evans (Glamorganshire, Mid.) 1390
Mr. Corbett (Glasgow, Tradeston) 1392
Mr. Whittaker 1393
Sir Edward Grey 1396
Mr. Harwood (Bolton) 1396
Mr. Munro Ferguson (Leith Burghs) 1397
Mr. Osmond Williams (Merionethshire) 1398

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Lloyd-George 1398

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 3, line 13, after the words last omitted, to insert the words 'provided that no new licence shall be granted until at least three weeks notice shall have been first given to the local authority for the area in which the premises are situate, and the justices have considered all representations made by such local authority, either in writing or at the hearing of the application, in respect of such application.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted.

Mr. A. J. Balfour 1400
Mr. Asquith 1401
Mr. Henderson (Durham, Barnard Castle) 1401
Mr. Whittaker 1401
Sir John Gorst (Cambridge University) 1402
Mr. A. J. Balfour 1402
Mr. Lawson Walton (Leeds, S.) 1403
Mr. Pemberton (Sunderland) 1404
Mr. Stuart Wortley (Sheffield, Hallam) 1404
Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis) 1405
Sir Edward Grey 1405
Mr. Butcher (York) 1406
Mr. Yoxall (Nottingham, W.) 1407
Sir Edward Carson 1408
Mr. Ellis Griffith (Anglesey) 1409
Mr. Ritchie (Croydon) 1410
Mr. Bryn Roberts (Carnarvonshire, Eifion) 1411
Mr. Marshall Hall (Lancashire, Southport) 1412
Mr. Lloyd Wharton 1412

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 178 ; Noes, 262. (Division List No. 223.)

Mr. Akers-Douglas 1415

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 14, to leave out Sub-section (2) and insert—

'(2) The justices of a licensing district on the grant of a new licence may attach to the grant of the licence such conditions, both as to the payments to be made and the tenure of the licence, and as to any other matters, as they think proper in the interests of the public, and shall attach such conditions as they think best adapted for preventing any private person from obtaining any benefit from any monopoly value of the licence.

'(3) For the purposes of this section a new on-licence may be granted for a term not exceeding seven years, and where a licence is so granted for a term, any application for a re-grant of the licence on the expiration of the term shall be treated as an application for the grant of a new licence, not as an application for the renewal of a licence, and during the continuance of the term the licence shall not require re-renewal.

'(4) The amount of any payments made in pursuance of any conditions under this section shall be collected and dealt with in the same manner as the duties on local taxation licences within the meaning of Section 20 of the Local Government Act, 1888.

'(5) A licence granted for a term under this section may (without prejudice to any other provisions as to forfeiture) be forfeited, if any condition imposed under this section is not complied with, by order of a Court of summary jurisdiction made on complaint, or if the holder of the licence is convicted of any offence committed by him, as such, by the Court by whom he is convicted; but where a licence is so forfeited the owner of the licensed premises shall have all the rights conferred on owners by Section 15 of the Licensing Act, 1874.' "—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question proposed, "That Sub-Section (2) stand part of the Clause."

Mr. Cripps (*Lancashire, Stretford*) 1419
Sir Robert Reid 1422
Mr. Peel (*Manchester, S.*) 1423

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

Licensing Bill [3rd Allotted Day.]

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. Lowther (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 4 :—

Amendment again proposed—

> "In page 3, line 14, to leave out Sub-section (2), and insert the words—
>
> "'(2) The justices of a licensing district on the grant of a new licence may attach to the grant of the licence such conditions, both as to the payments to be made and the tenure of the licence, and as to any other matters as they think proper in the interests of the public, and shall attach such conditions as they think best adapted for preventing any private person from obtaining any benefit from any monopoly value of the licence.
>
> "'(3) For the purposes of this section a new on-licence may be granted for a term not exceeding seven years, and where a licence is so granted for a term any application for a re-grant of the licence on the expiration of the term shall be treated as an application for the grant of a new licence, not as an application for the renewal of a licence, and during the continuance of the term the licence shall not require renewal.
>
> "'(4) The amount of any payments made in pursuance of any conditions under this section shall be collected and dealt with in the same manner as the duties on local taxation licences within the meaning of Section 20 of the Local Government Act, 1888.
>
> "'(5) A licence granted for a term under this section may (without prejudice to any other provisions as to forfeiture) be forfeited, if any condition imposed under this section is not complied with, by order of a Court of summary jurisdiction made on complaint, or if the holder of the licence is convicted of any offence committed by him as such, by the Court by whom he is convicted, but where a licence is so forfeited the owner of the licensed premises shall have all the rights conferred on owners by Section 15 of the Licensing Act, 1874.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers Douglas.*)

Question again proposed, "That Sub-section (2) stand part of the clause."

Mr. Peel	1425
Mr. Edmund Robertson	1426
Mr. Duke (Plymouth)	1427
Mr. Disraeli (Cheshire, Altrincham)	1428
Mr. Ainsworth (Argyllshire)	1429
Sir Philip Muntz (Warwickshire, Tamworth)	1429
Mr. Lawson Walton	1430
Mr. A. J. Balfour	1433
Mr. Whittaker	1437
Sir J. Stirling-Maxwell (Glasgow, College)	1440
Mr. Bond (Nottingham, E.)	1441
Mr. Cripps	1442

Question put and negatived.

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

And, it being Eleven of the clock, the Chairman proceeded, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 5th July, to put the Question on the Amendment already proposed from the Chair.

July 12.] **Page**

Question, "That these words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

The Chairman then proceeded to put forthwith the Question necessary to dispose of the allotted Business to be concluded on the 3rd allotted Day.

Question, "That the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill," put, and agreed to.

Clause 5 :—

Mr. Whitley 1443

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 23, to leave out the words 'may, if they think fit,' and insert the word 'shall.'"—(*Mr. Whitley.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. Akers Douglas 1444
Mr. J. H. Lewis (*Flint Boroughs*) 1445

Question put.

The Committee divided: Ayes, 267; Noes, 157. (Division List No. 224.)

Mr. Herbert Roberts (*Denbighshire, W.*) 1449

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 24, after the word 'Act,' to insert the words 'which districts shall consist of the licensing districts or licensing divisions into which such area is now divided.'"—(*Mr. Herbert Roberts.*)

Question proposed, "That these words be there inserted."

Sir Edward Carson 1450
Mr. Whitley 1450

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Nussey (*Pontefract*) 1451

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 26, at the end, to insert the words, 'Provided that the annual value of premises to be taken as for the purpose of the publican's licence duty within any such district shall in the aggregate be not less than ten thousand pounds.'"—(*Mr. Nussey.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Akers Douglas 1452

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 124 ; Noes, 231. (Division List No. 225.)

Mr. Levy (*Leicestershire, Loughborough*) 1455

Amendment proposed—

" In page 3, line 27, to leave out sub-section (2)."—(*Mr. Levy.*)

Question proposed, " That the words of sub-section (2) to the word 'appointed.' "

Sir Edward Carson 1456

And, it being Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again To-morrow.

County of Suffolk Bill.—Ordered, That Mr. Goddard be discharged, and that Mr. Soames be added to the Select Committee.—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*) .. 1456

Adjourned at three minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: WEDNESDAY, 13TH JULY, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Skipton Water and Improvement Bill; Soothill Nether Urban District Tramways Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to. 1457

De Trafford Estate Bill [LORDS] ; Ilford Urban District Council Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed 1457

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [LORDS].—Read a second time, and committed 1457

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill.—Report from the Committee that they had divided the Bill into two Bills :—

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill (comprising the Hartlepool and Waterford Orders) ; and

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill. (comprising the Islay Order), pursuant to Standing Order 208A, brought up, and read.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No 2) Bill. Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed] [Title amended] ; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered to-morrow. 1457

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill. Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed] ; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered to-morrow 1457

July 13.] *Page*

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.—Petitions against; from Aberchirder; Barnoldby le Beck; Barrow on Humber; Blackburn; Bozeat; Chorlton cum Hardy; Clacton on sea; Earl's Barton; Edinburgh; Enfield; Finedon; Heaton Mersey; Heaton Moor; Hounslow; Irchester; Levenshulme; Little Harrowden; Liverpool; London (N.W.); Louth; Lunesdale; Mangotsfield; New Brighton; Newcastle-on-Tyne (three); Oldbury; Ottery St. Mary; Pegswood; Reddish; Rosset; St. Margaret's; Scunthorpe; South Somercotes; Stafford; Stallingborough Sturminster Marshall; Wellingborough; Willington; Wimborne; Winterton; Wollaston, and Woodside; to lie upon the Table 1457

LICENSING BILL.—Petition from Bermondsey, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1458

STREET BETTING BILL [LORDS].—Petition from Dundee, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 1458

VALUATION BILL.—Petition from Eastbourne, for alteration; to lie upon the Table. 1458

VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS ACT, 1897.—Petitions for alteration of Law; from Barnsley; Jarrow; and Wood Green; to lie upon the Table 1458

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

PRISONS (ENGLAND AND WALES).—Paper [presented 12th July] to be printed. [No. 173] 1458

SEA FISHERIES REGULATION ACT, 1888.—Paper [presented 12th July] to be printed. [No. 248] 1458

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).—Copy presented, of Colonial Report, No. 420 (St. Helena, Annual Report for 1903) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 1458

RAILWAY (CONTINUOUS BRAKES).—Copy presented, of Return by Railway Companies of the United Kingdom for the six months ending the 31st December, 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1458

GAS AND WATER WORKS FACILITIES ACT, 1870.—Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade as to dispensing with the consents of the Melbourn Rural District Council and the Meldreth and Shepreth Parish Councils in the case of the Meldreth and Melbourn District Gas and Water Provisional Order [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 249] 1459

GAS AND WATER WORKS FACILITIES ACT, 1870.—Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade as to dispensing with the consent of the Little Stambridge Parish Meeting in the case of the Rochford Gas Provisional Order [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 250] 1459

GAS AND WATER WORKS FACILITIES ACT, 1870.—Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade as to dispensing with the consent of the Cheshunt Urban District Council in the case of the Waltham Abbey and Cheshunt Gas Provisional Order [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 251.] 1459

Superannuation Act, 1884.—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 9th July, 1904, declaring that George J. Stuck, Skilled Labourer, Royal Laboratory, War Office, was appointed without a Civil Service Certificate through inadvertence on the part of the Head of his Department [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1459

Government Ships Bill.—Copy ordered, "of Memorandum explanatory of the Provisions of the Government Ships Bill."—(*Mr. Pretyman.*)
Copy presented accordingly; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 252.] 1459

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords].—Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords]."—(*Mr. Bonar Law.*) 1459

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 3) Bill [Lords].—Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 3) Bill Lords]."—(*Mr. Bonar Law.*) 1460

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords].—Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]."—(*Mr. Bonar Law.*) 1460

Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords].—Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]."—(*Mr. Bonar Law.*) 1460

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [Lords].—Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [Lords]."—(*Mr. Bonar Law.*) 1460

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [Lords]—Copy ordered "of Memorandum stating the nature of Proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No 4) Bill [Lords]."—(*Mr. Bonar Law.*) 1460

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill [Lords].—Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No 6) Bill [Lords]."—(*Mr Bonar Law.*) 1460

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Irish Degree of Bachelor of Arts.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham .. ..

Increase of Pauperism in the Large Parishes of Scotland.—Question, Mr. Alexander Cross (Glasgow, Camlachie); Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray .. 1461

British Naval Display in the Streets of Rome.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 1462

July 13.] *Page*

Appointment of Telegraph Boys to Rural Telegraph Offices.—Question, Mr. Mansfield (Lincolnshire, Spalding); Answer, Lord Stanley 1463

Teaching of Hygiene in Schools.—Question, Dr. Thompson (Monaghan, N.); Answer, Sir William Anson 1463

Local Education Fund—Use of Surplus Money where Endowment exceeds Education Rate.—Question, Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice (Wiltshire, Cricklade); Answer, Sir William Anson 1464

Naval Works at Rosyth.—Question, Mr. Scott Montagu (Hampshire, New Forest); Answer, Mr. Arthur Lee 1465

German Officers' visit to Devonport—Photographing Fortifications, etc.—Question, Mr. Scott Montagu; Answer, Mr. Arthur Lee 1465

National Expenditure for 1903-4.—Question, Mr. McKenna (Monmouthshire, N.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1465

Revenue from Additional Duty on Goods removed from Bond.—Question, Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1466

Tibet Expedition—Relief of India of Cost Involved.—Question, Mr. Herbert Roberts; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1467

Salary of Dr. Collins of Ballinaslo.—Question, Dr. Thompson; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1467

Salary of Teachers of Victoria Street National School, Lurgan.—Question, Colonel Saunderson (Armagh, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1468

Army—Men with less than Five Years to serve.—Question, Captain Norton (Newington, W.); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1469

Military Operations in Northern Nigeria.—Question, Dr. Farquharson (Aberdeenshire, W.); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1473

Crime in Ceylon—Transportation instead of Capital Punishment.—Question, Mr. Schwann (Manchester, N.); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1473

Construction of Malay Peninsula Railway.—Question, Mr. Henniker Heaton (Canterbury); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1474

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Admiralty Contractors—Trade Unionism.—Questions, Mr. Charles Hobhouse (Bristol, E.), Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar), and Mr. Shackleton (Lancashire, Clitheroe); Answers, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge) 1474

War Office Contractors and Trade Unionism.—Question, Mr. Charles Hobhouse; Answer, The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Mr Bromley-Davenport, Cheshire, Macclesfield) 1475

Army Horses and Epizootic Lymphangitis.—Question, Mr. Charles Hobhouse; Answer, Mr. Bromley-Davenport 1476

July 13.]

Page

Chinese Coolies in the Transvaal—Desertions from Compounds.—Questions, Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland), Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.) and Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answers, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington) .. 1476

Treatment of Chinese Coolies on Landing in South Africa.—Question, Dr. Macnamara; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1477

Administration of Native Affairs in the Transvaal.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1477

Tithe Reform in Macedonia.—Question, Mr. Hugh Law (Donegal, W.); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 1478

Swiss Lace sold at Nice as Irish.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) .. 1478

Statistical Abstract of the United Kingdom.—Question, Sir John Leng (Dundee); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 1478

Borstal Convict Prison—Attack on Warders.—Questions, Dr. Macnamara and Sir Ernest Flower (Bradford, W.); Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 1479

Birmingham Mint and Silver Coinage for the Crown Colonies.—Questions, Mr. Bayley (Derbyshire, Chesterfield) and Mr. Markham (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield); Answers, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.) 1480

Fraudulent Whisky.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 1480

Whisky in Bond.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish .. 1481

Forest Gate Barrack School.—Question, Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); Answer, The Secretary to the Local Government Board (Mr. Grant Lawson, Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) 1482

Wages in the Post Office—Report of the Bradford Committee.—Question, Mr. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green); Answer, The Postmaster-General (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 1482

Irish Degree of Bachelor of Arts.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 1482

Queen's College, Belfast.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 1482

Queen's College, Belfast, Scholarships.—Questions, Mr. MacVeagh; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 1483

Estates Commissioners—Inspectors.—Questions, Mr. Joseph Devlin (Kilkenny, N.), Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.), and Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 1483

Lettir (Kerry) School.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, Mr. Wyndham .. 1484

July 13.] Page

KEELNABRACH SCHOOL, KERRY.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1484

TEACHING OF IRISH LANGUAGE IN IRISH SCHOOLS.—Question, Captain Donelan (Cork County, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1485

CASE OF CONSTABLE ANDERSON.—Questions, Mr. Joseph Devlin; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 1485

IRISH SALT FIRKIN BUTTER INDUSTRY.—Questions, Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.), Mr. Lundon (Limerick, E.), Mr. Kilbride (Kildare, S.), and Mr. O'Shaughnessy (Limerick, W.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 1486

DONEGAL HOMESPUNS.—Question, Mr. Hugh Law; Answer, Mr. Wyndham .. 1487

SALTERS COMPANY'S TRUST AT MAGHERAFELT.—Question, Mr. Joseph Devlin; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1488

COLLIERSTOWN EVICTED TENANT.—Question, Mr. Sheehy (Meath, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1488

BANGOR (COUNTY DOWN) POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Joseph Devlin; Answer, Lord Stanley 1489

TRANSVAAL ADMINISTRATION.—Questions, Dr. Macnamara and Mr. Markham; Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1489

THE COLONIAL OFFICE VOTE.—Questions, Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe) and Sir Henry Fowler (Wolverhampton, E.); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1491

EDUCATION (DEFAULTING AUTHORITIES) BILL. Questions, Mr. Mansfield, Dr. Macnamara, and Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour .. 1491

ARMY REFORM—THE SECRETARY FOR WAR'S STATEMENT.—Questions, Sir Arthur Hayter (Walsall), Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs), and Mr. Winston Churchill (Oldham); Answers, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury (Sir A. Acland-Hood, Somersetshire, Wellington) 1492

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Mr. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection: That they had discharged the following Members from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures: Mr. Baird and Mr. Hunter Craig, and had appointed in substitution, Mr. Seymour Ormsby-Gore and Mr. Edward Mitchell.

Report to lie upon the Table 1493

Licensing Bill [4TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Page

Clause 5.

Amendment again proposed—

"In page 3, line 27, to leave out Sub-section (2)."—(*Mr. Levy.*)

Question again proposed, "That the words of Sub-section (2) to the word 'appointed,' in page 3, line 28, stand part of the clause."

The Solicitor-General (*Sir Edward Carson, Dublin University*) 1494
Colonel Lockwood (*Essex, Epping*) 1494
Mr. Galloway (*Manchester, S.W.*) 1495

Question put.

The Committee divided: Ayes, 193; Noes, 123. (Division List No. 226.)

Mr. Worsley-Taylor (*Lancashire, Blackpool*) 1499

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 29, after the word 'made,' to insert the words 'by them to be approved by a Secretary of State.'"—(*Mr. Worsley-Taylor.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir Edward Carson 1499
Mr. Henry Hobhouse (*Somersetshire, E.*) 1500

Question put, and agreed to

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 29, after the word 'Act,' to insert the words 'providing for the mode of appointment, number, quorum, and procedure of committees.'"—(*Mr. Worsley-Taylor.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 29, after the word 'and,' to insert the words 'except in a county borough.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers Douglas.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Helme (*Lancashire. Lancaster*) 1500

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 29, after the words last inserted, to insert the words 'or a borough having a separate commission of the peace and a population of over twenty-five thousand.'"—(*Mr. Helme.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Henry Hobhouse 1501
Sir Albert Rollit (*Islington, S.*) 1502
Mr. Trevelyan (*Yorkshire, W.R., Elland*) 1502

Dr. Hutchinson (Sussex, Rye) 1503
Sir Edward Carson 1503
Mr. Lloyd-George (Carnarvon Boroughs) 1504
Sir James Woodhouse (Huddersfield) 1505
Mr. Fison (Yorkshire, W.R., Doncaster) 1506
Mr. Theodore Taylor (Lancashire, Radcliffe) 1506
Sir Edward Grey (Northumberland, Berwick) 1507
Mr. Higham (Yorkshire, W.R., Sowerby) 1508
Lieut.-Colonel Pryce Jones (Montgomery Boroughs) 1509
Mr. Trevelyan 1509

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out the words 'twenty-five' and insert the word 'ten.'" —(*Mr. Trevelyan.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'twenty-five' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

Mr. Nussey (Pontefract) 1510
Sir Edward Strachey (Somersetshire, E.) 1510
Mr. Worsley-Taylor 1511
Mr. Emmott (Oldham) 1512
Mr. Courtenay Warner (Staffordshire, Lichfield) 1512
Mr. Pym (Bedford) 1513
Mr. Wallace (Perth) 1514
Viscount Morpeth (Birmingham, S.) 1514
Sir Joseph Leese (Lancashire, Accrington) 1515
Mr. Shackleton (Lancashire, Clitheroe) 1516
Mr. Coghill (Stoke-upon-Trent) 1516
Mr. George Whiteley (Yorkshire, W.R. Pudsey) 1517
Mr. Henderson (Durham, Barnard Castle) 1517
Sir Edward Carson 1518
Mr. Helme 1520

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 281; Noes, 130. (Division List No. 227.)

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 171; Noes, 246. (Division List No. 228.)

Mr. Slack (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) 1529

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 32, after the word 'Act,' to insert the words 'and any person entitled to be heard by such Committee may appear and be heard by counsel or solicitor on his behalf.'"—(*Mr. Slack*).

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir Albert Rollit 1529
Mr. H. D. Greene (Shrewsbury) 1530
Mr. J. A. Pease (Essex, Saffron Walden) 1531
Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis) 1531

Page

Sir Henry Fowler (*Wolverhampton, E.*) 1531
Sir Edward Carson 1532
Mr. Lloyd-George 1532
Mr. Theodore Taylor 1533
Mr. Slack 1534

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 161 ; Noes. 258. (Division List No. 229.)

Mr. Disraeli (*Cheshire, Altrincham*) 1537

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 32, to leave out from the word 'and' to the end of Sub-section (2)."—(*Mr. Disraeli.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

Sir Edward Carson 1539

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 33, at end, to add the words '(3) The justices of a licensing district being a county borough shall exercise their powers under the Licensing Acts, 1828 to 1902, as to the renewal of licences through the borough licensing committee appointed under Section 38 of The Licensing Act, 1872, but such number as the whole body of justices acting in and for the borough determine shall be substituted for seven as the maximum number of that committee.' "—(*Mr. Secretary Akers Douglas.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir James Woodhouse 1539

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 4, after the word 'such' to insert the word 'greater.' "—(*Sir James Woodhouse.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'greater' be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

Mr. Akers Douglas 1540

Amendment to the proposed Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 4, after the second word 'of' to insert the word 'qualified.' "—(*Sir James Woodhouse.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'qualified' be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

Sir Edward Carson .. 1541
Mr. Whitley .. 1541

Amendment to the proposed Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Question, " That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Mr. Herbert Roberts (*Denbighshire, W.*) .. 1542

Amendment proposed—

" In page 3, line 33, at end, to add the words, ' No justice disqualified under the Licensing Acts, and no owner, lessee, or occupier of any licensed premises within any county, and no agent of such person acting, or who during the two years preceding shall have acted for him in any wise in connection with such licensed premises shall be qualified to act as a justice within such county for any of the purposes of this Act." "—(*Mr. Herbert Roberts.*)

Question proposed, " That those words be there inserted."

Sir Edward Carson .. 1542

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Cripps (*Lancashire, Stretford*) .. 1542

Amendment proposed—

" In page 3, line 33, at end, to add the words—' (3) No justice who has taken part in any decision of quarter sessions shall if on the committee, take part in any decision of the committee when the grant or renewal of such licence is under consideration.' "—(*Mr. Cripps.*)

Question proposed, " That those words be there inserted."

Sir Edward Carson .. 1543
Mr. Cripps .. 1543

Amendment by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Ellis Griffith (*Anglesey*) .. 1543

Amendment proposed—

" In page 3, line 29, after the words last inserted, to insert the words ' or a non-county borough having a separate commission of the peace.' "—(*Mr. Ellis Griffith.*)

Sir Edward Carson .. 1544

Sir Edward Grey .. 1544
Mr. Lloyd-George .. 1544

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Question, " That Clause 5, as amended, stand part of the Bill," put, and agreed to.

Clause 6.

Mr. Lloyd-George 1545

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 34, after the word 'may,' to insert the words 'subject to the consent of Parliament.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Asquith (*Fifeshire, E.*) 1546
Mr. Gibson Bowles 1547
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (*Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.* 1550
Mr. Rose (*Cambridgeshire, Newmarket*) 1552
Sir James Joicey (*Durham, Chester-le-Street*) 1552

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

Licensing Bill [4TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 6.

Amendment again proposed—

"In page 3, line 34, after the word 'may' to insert the words 'subject to the consent of Parliament.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir James Joicey 1553
Mr. Renwick (*Newcastle-on-Tyne*) 1554
Mr. Broadhurst (*Leicester*) 1555
Mr. Lloyd Wharton 1556
Mr. George White (*Norfolk, N.W.*) 1556
Mr. Akers-Douglas 1558
Mr. Ellis Griffith 1558
Mr. H. C. Richards (*Finsbury, E.*) 1559
Mr. Thomas Shaw (*Hawick Burghs*) 1561
Sir Edward Carson 1562
Mr. Bryn Roberts (*Carnarvonshire, Eifion*) 1564
Mr. Edmund Robertson 1565
Sir Edward Carson 1565
Mr. Lawson Walton (*Leeds, S.*) 1565

July 13.] Page

Mr. Bousfield (*Hackney, N.*) 1567
Mr. Ainsworth (*Argyllshire*) 1568
Mr. Disraeli 1568
Mr. Bryn-Roberts 1569
Mr. Lough (*Islington, W.*) 1570

Question put.

The Committee divided: Ayes, 181; Noes, 263. (Division List No. 230.)

And, it being after Eleven of the clock, the Chairman proceeded, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 5th July, successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments moved by the Government of which notice had been given, and on every Question necessary to dispose of the allotted Business to be concluded on the 4th allotted day.

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 4, line 8, after the word 'committees,' to insert the words 'of quarter sessions and for the constitution of those committees where requisite as standing committees, and also for the addition to those committees in the case of a county, of representatives of the justices of any boroughs within the county not being county boroughs, but having a separate commission of the peace.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 4, line 10, to leave out from the word 'procedure,' to the word 'and' in line 13, and insert the words 'of quarter sessions on the consideration of the reports of justices of a licensing district under this Act and on any hearing under this Act with reference to the refusal of the renewal of on-licences or the division of the amount to be paid as compensation.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Question put, "That the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided—Ayes, 267; Noes, 182. (Division List, No. 231.)

Clause 7.

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 4, line 20, after the word 'substitution,' to insert th words 'for quarter sessions.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 4, line 21, to leave out the words 'for quarter sessions.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 21, to leave out from the word 'sessions,' to the end of line 24."—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Question put, "That the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 267 ; Noes, 178. (Division List No. 232.)

Clause 8.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 29, at the end, to insert the words, '(2) If the justices of a licensing district refuse to renew an on-licence on the ground that the holder of the licence has persistently and unreasonably refused to supply suitable refreshment (other than intoxicating liquor) or on the ground that the holder of the licence has failed to fulfil any reasonable undertaking given to the justices on the grant or previous renewal of the licence, the justices shall be deemed to have refused the licence on the ground that the premises have been ill-conducted.' "—(*Mr. Solicitor-General.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 40, after the word 'having,' to insert the words, a separate commission of the peace and.' "—(*Mr. Solicitor-General.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 2, at the end, to insert the words, 'But where quarter sessions have customarily been held separately by adjournment or otherwise for any part of a county as defined by this Act, the Secretary of State may by order, on the application of quarter sessions for the whole county, constitute for the purposes of this Act any part of the county for which quarter sessions are for the time being so separately held a separate county, and the justices usually sitting at such separate quarter sessions a separate quarter sessions, and make all necessary provisions for the administration of the Act in such a case." (*Mr. Solicitor-General.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put , and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 6, after the word 'accordingly,' to insert the words 'and the expression "existing on-licence" means an on-licence in force at the date of the passing of this Act, and includes a licence granted by way of renewal from time to time of a licence so in force, whether such licence continues to be held by the same person, or has been or may be transferred to any other person or persons.' "—(*Mr. Solicitor-General.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 265 ; Noes, 175. (Division List, No. 233.)

Question put, "That the clause as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 259 ; Noes, 164. (Division List, No. 234.)

Clause 9.

Question put, "That the clause stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 280 ; Noes, 118. (Division List No. 235.)

Schedule :—

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 6, line 24, at the end, to add the words 'and in the case of any licensed premises which are certified by the justices of the licensing district on the application of the holder of the licence to be used only as public gardens, picture galleries, exhibitions, places of public or private entertainment, railway refreshment rooms, *bonâ fide* restaurants or ating houses, or for any other purposes to which the holding of a licence is merely auxiliary, such rate, not less than one-third of that charged in other cases, as the justices think proper under the circumstances.' "—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Question put, "That this schedule, as amended, be the first schedule of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 233 ; Noes, 142. (Division List, No. 236.)

New Schedule (Scale of Deductions) :—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That this schedule be added to the Bill," put, and agreed to.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Chairman do report the Bill, as amended, to the House."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 211 ; Noes, 117. (Division List No. 237.)

Bill reported ; as amended, to be considered upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 271.]

And it being One of the clock, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House, pursuant to the Standing Order, without Question put.

Adjourned at One o'clock.

END OF TABLE OF CONTENTS TO VOL. CXXXVII.

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(*AUTHORISED EDITION*)

IN THE

FIFTH SESSION OF THE *TWENTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT* OF THE
UNITED KINGDOM OF *GREAT BRITAIN* AND *IRELAND*, IN THE
FOURTH YEAR OF THE REIGN OF

HIS MAJESTY KING EDWARD VII.

NINTH VOLUME OF SESSION.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 29th June, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Manchester Ship Canal (Finance) Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

Shipley Urban District Council Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Saddleworth and Springhead Tramways Bill (changed from "Saddleworth and Springhead Tramways (Abandonment) Bill"). As amended, considered.

Ordered, That Standing Orders Nos. 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed. [New Title.]

Stretford Urban District Council Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed.

Great Yarmouth Corporation Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments, from the Police and Sanitary Committee [Section B]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Metropolitan District Railway Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP 10).

Sir LEWIS MCIVER reported from the Committee on Group 10 of Private Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, they had adjourned until Tuesday next, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

PETITIONS.

ALIENS BILL.

Petition from Paisley, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

The asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.

EDUCATION (LOCAL AUTHORITY DEFAULT) BILL.

Petition from Battersea, against; to lie upon the Table.

LAND VALUES (ASSESSMENT AND RATING) BILL.

Petition from Croydon, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; from Aberystwyth (two); Amble; Ashington; Bamber Bridge; Bamford; Battersea; Beverley; Blackburn; Blackley; Blackwood; Blundellsands; Bradford (two); Broomhill; Butterwick; Cymdy; Capel; Cardiff (two); Castleton; Cathays Park; Cawthorn; Chorlton Lane; Coombe Dingle; Coningsby; Cotherstone; Cullen; Cwmllynan; Cwmsyfiog (two); Darlington (two); Denby Dale; Dunkeld; Earlsheaton; East Dulwich; Emsworth; Ettingshall; Fareham; Fishguard; Glasgow (two); Glynceiriog; Greentown; Hanley; Hartlepool; Hawthorn Hill; Hayle; Heywood; Higher Walton; High Wycombe; Hoghton; Hopwood; Houghton-le-Spring; Hull (three); Hunslet (two); Hyde; Hyde Park; Kilmarnock; Kirkstead; Leeds (two); Leytonstone; Littlethorpe; Llansantffraid; Llansilin; London (two); Malpas; Manningham (two); Mareham-le-Fen; Middleton Cheney; Mill Hill; Mirfield; Moorside; Morley; Nelson; Newcastle-under-Lyme; New Tredegar; Niton; North Walsham; Old Charlton (five); Oswestry; Pontllanfraith; Portessie; Port Isaac; Radcliffe; Roath; Rochdale; Rock; Rock Ferry (two); Roupell Park; Sandown; Savile Town; Sheepwash; Shrewsbury; Sompting; Southdown Chale; Staveley; Sudbury (two); Sunderland; Swalwell; Thornhill; Threapwood; Throckley; Thurlstone; Todmorden; Trinant; Tumby Woodside; Tunstall; Tursdale; Ventnor; Wadebridge; Washington; Westbury-on-Trym; Wildmore; Wilmslow; Witton Gilbert; and Woodford (eleven); to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Brighouse; Hammersmith; and Warwick; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES (TREASURY POWERS) BILL.

Petition from Battersea, against; to lie upon the Table.

SHOP HOURS BILL.

Petition from Dundee, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

STREET BETTING BILL.

Petition from Westminster, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

TUBERCULOSIS (ANIMALS) COMPENSATION BILL.

Petitions against; from Edinburgh; and Renfrew; to lie upon the Table.

VALUATION BILL.

Petition from Bury, against; to lie upon the Table.

VALUATION BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Dorking; Hollingbourn; Rye; and Wandsworth; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRANSVAAL AND ORANGE RIVER COLONY.

Copy presented, of Correspondence relating to the Finances of the Transvaal and Orange River Colony [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP (VENTILATION IN COTTON CLOTH FACTORIES).

Copy presented, of Report to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, by F. Scudder, Esquire, F.I.C., on air tests in humid cotton weaving sheds [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NATIONAL GALLERY (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Report of the Director of the National Gallery of Ireland to the Board of Governors and Guardians for the year 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

OUNTY OFFICERS AND COURTS (IRELAND) ACT, 1877.

Account presented, of the Receipts and Payments under the Act during the year ended the 31st March, 1904 [by Act];

to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 231.]

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of Regulations for the Training of Teachers and for the Examination of Students in Training Colleges [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3199 and 3200 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Lunacy. Copy of Fifty-eighth Report of the Commissioners in Lunacy to the Lord Chancellor [by Act]; to lie upon the Table and to be printed. [No. 232.]

LOCAL AUTHORITIES IN SCOTLAND (TECHNICAL EDUCATION).

Return ordered, "showing the extent to which, and the manner in which, Local Authorities in Scotland have allocated and applied funds to the purposes of Technical Education during the year ending the 15th day of May, 1904, under the following Acts: Local Taxation (Customs and Excise) Act, 1890; Education and Local Taxation Account (Scotland) Act, 1892; Technical Schools (Scotland) Act, 1887; Technical Instruction Amendment (Scotland) Act, 1892; and Public Libraries Acts."—(*Mr. A. Graham Murray.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

"The Times" in Government Departments.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury will he say which Government Department takes daily forty copies of *The Times* at the public expense.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) I understand that the Department alluded to is the Admiralty, which takes thirty-nine copies of *The Times* daily.

Electric Railways—Precautions for Public Safety.

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): To ask the President of the Board of Trade what Orders, if any, have been made by the Board under Section 1, Subsection (f), of The Railways (Electric Power) Act, 1903, for securing the safety of the public; whether such Orders include adequate protection from contact with a live rail; whether any of the fatal and other accidents which have occurred from contact with live rails have been found to be due to the neglect of the companies to comply with the terms of Orders of the Board, or to neglect of other precautions; and what steps the Board are now taking or will take to effectually prevent the recurrence of such accidents.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) No Orders have yet been made under the Act referred to. Inquiries are being held into two recent accidents that occurred through the electrical working of railways, and when the reports of these inquiries are received the question of the precautions to be taken will be fully considered.

Delay in Establishment of Telephone System between Ballymena and Londonderry.

MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether, sufficient support to warrant the introduction of the trunk telephone scheme being now forthcoming, he will say what is the cause of the delay in having communication established between Ballymena and Londonderry, including branches to Limavady, Coleraine, and Portrush; and when the subscribers in these towns may expect to be connected with Belfast.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) Applications for a telephone service have been received from several other towns in the North of Ireland besides those mentioned by the hon. Member, and it has been necessary to obtain further estimates in order that the scheme now under consideration may be made as comprehensive as the circumstances will justify. I hope, however, very shortly to be able to announce the result and to have the work put in hand where the requisite support is forthcoming.

The Mutessarifliks of Selfidge and Koritza and the Muerzteg Agreement.

MR. MOON (St. Pancras, N.): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Mutessarifliks of Selfidge and Koritza, which are mostly inhabited by Christians of non-Slavonic origin, are at present excluded from the operation of the Muerzteg Agreement.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) This is at present the case so far as the reorganisation of the *gendarmerie* is concerned, but His Majesty's Ambassador has urged and will continue to urge that, as circumstances permit, the operation of this part of the scheme shall be further extended. In other respects the districts in question fall within the application of the scheme.

British Commercial Agent at Vladivostock.

MR. MOON: To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the British commercial agent appointed to Vladivostock is remaining there; and, if not, where and how he is employed.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) He is now at Wei-hai-Wei.

Commercial Treaty between the United States and Abyssinia.

MAJOR EVANS-GORDON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has any information with regard to a commercial treaty recently concluded between the United States and Abyssinia; and, if so, whether such treaty contemplates any cessions of territorial or mining rights.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) His Majesty's Government are not able to give any information on the subject.

Value of Licensed Premises for Probate.

MR. CORBETT (Glasgow, Tradeston): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will obtain from the Inland Revenue Department and state particulars of the last six cases, without necessarily mentioning names, where licensed premises have been valued for probate, showing, in each case, the total value at which the licensed premises were assessed, and the nature of the interest on such premises thus taxed; and the annual value at which such licensed premises were assessed for the purpose of the publican's licence duty.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) I will inquire how far it may be possible to supply such particulars as are asked for, and will let the hon. Member know the result as soon as possible.

Export of Coal above the Value of 6s. per Ton.

MR. CHARLES DOUGLAS (Lanarkshire, N.W.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what quantity of coal, valued at not more than 6s. per ton f.o.b., was shipped for export from this country during the twelve months ending 31st December, 1903.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The total quantity of coal of a declared value not exceeding 6s. per ton f.o.b. exported during the twelve months ended 31st December, 1903, was 4,550,332 tons.

Income-Tax Inquiry—Exemption of Co-operative Societies.

MR. LOUIS SINCLAIR (Essex, Romford): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he intends to carry out the promise made by the ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer last year to appoint a Departmental Committee to consider the practice with regard to income-tax payment; and, if so, whether the question of co-operative societies' exemption will be considered by the Committee.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) A Committee was appointed two months ago, and the names of the members and the terms of reference have been publicly notified on several occasions. It is for the Committee to consider whether any questions relating to the position of co-operative societies come within their reference.

Duty-Free Spirits under Section 8 of Finance Act, 1902.

MR. LOUIS SINCLAIR: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will grant a Return showing how far the exemption as to duty-free spirits by the power granted by Section 8 of the Finance Act of 1902 has been taken advantage of.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) If the hon. Member will send me the form which he would like the Return to take, I will look into it and see whether it can be granted.

Liquor and Drug Traffic in India.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been directed to the reference in the Financial Statement of the Government of India for 1904-5 (page 6), to the continued increase in the revenue derived from the sale of intoxicating liquors or drugs, and to the announcement that the Government of India were devoting special attention to this matter in the interests of temperance; whether the action of the Government of India in this direction has taken the form of an official inquiry; and whether further legislation for the purpose of checking the increasing consumption of alcohol and drugs in India is contemplated.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) I have seen the passage in question. I am not aware that any general inquiry is contemplated. A good many specific questions regarding the working of the Excise system in different parts of India have closely engaged the attention of the Government of India and the Local Governments, and various improvements have been effected. Excise Amendment Acts have lately been enacted in Burma and Bengal, and further legislation is in progress in Bengal.

Capture of Illig—Explosive Bullets.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he has any official Reports showing that at the bombardment and capture of Illig explosive bullets were used by the English forces.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The reply is in the negative.

White Labour in Transvaal Gold Mines.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will state what was the number of white men employed in the Transvaal gold mines in the latest month for which returns are available.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) The latest return of the number of white men employed in the Transvaal gold mines is that for April, 1904, 12,740, who were at work on the last full working day.

Education (Scotland) Bill.

SIR J. STIRLING - MAXWELL (Glasgow, College): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury when the Education (Scotland) Bill will be taken.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) I am afraid I cannot at present fix the day for resuming the discussion in Committee on this Bill.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Army Clothing Factory—Atmosphere in Pressing Rooms.

MR. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether he can state what is the proportion of carbon dioxide in each 10,000 volumes of air in each of the six pressing rooms at the Army Clothing Factory.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Mr. BROMLEY DAVENPORT, Cheshire, Macclesfield): Samples of air were taken last Friday from three rooms at the factory including one of the pressing rooms (being the room in which Alice Wright pressed her work). The proportion of carbonic acid in the press-room varied from 5·7 per 10,000 volumes at the south end to 9·0 at the north end. The samples were taken after the workers had been at work three to four hours, and the result was considered satisfactory by the District Factory Inspector.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): Is the hon. Gentleman aware that notice was given of the intended visit of the Factory Inspector; that the rooms were in consequence cleared in the morning contrary to usage; that they were sprinkled with water contrary to usage also, and that the irons were cooled?

MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: No, Sir, I am not aware of that, but I will inquire, and if necessary there shall be another test.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: I do not suggest that the atmosphere was not as the hon. Member has suggested, because I do not know.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the fact that on 1st May, 1902,† the Financial Secretary to the War Office stated in reply to a Question as to improving the accommodation in the pressing rooms of the Royal Army Clothing Factory, that the number of persons employed on pressing irons was 1,348, he will take immediate steps to improve the ventilation since these persons are now in the rooms in considerable numbers from time to time, although they are not constantly employed there.

In putting this Question the hon. and gallant Member asked leave to explain that it was by inadvertence on a former occasion he omitted the date of the year when the Question was put and thus incurred the censure of Mr. Speaker.

MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: In May, 1902, it was stated that before the war 1,348 women used the pressing irons, which then numbered about 170. At the present time there are 1,314 women using 180 pressing irons. The women only use the pressing irons occasionally, the time spent in the pressing rooms varying from one to two hours per week. My right hon. friend stated on Monday ‡ in reply to a Question that measures are being taken and will very shortly be completed to improve the atmospheric condition of certain of the rooms.

The Mowatt Committee's Report.

MR. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War when the summary of the Mowatt Committee's Report, stating its proposals and how far they had been adopted by Ministers, as promised by him, will be in the hands of Members.

MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: In reply to the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition, in debate on 9th March,§ the Secretary of State for War stated that such a summary could be published in lieu of the whole Report, but as the right hon. Gentleman did not press for such summary no further steps were taken in the matter. If the hon. Member now desires to have it published the measures necessary shall be taken.

Recruitment of Chinese Coolies for the Transvaal.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been called to the advertisement in Chinese of the terms of contract which appeared in the *China Times* of 29th March last, and which purported to contain and to explain the provisions of the Labour Ordinance under which the Chinese coolies were to be recruited; whether he is aware that in this advertisement no mention was made of the following points: that the labourer is to be compulsorily repatriated at the end of his term of service; that the work will be underground work; that the labourer is to be confined to a compound; and that he is prohibited from trading or from owning property; and will he state whether all mention of the right of the labourer to be accompanied by his wife and children was omitted; and whether the rate of wages for day work was not stated to be 25s. per calendar month; and whether any Chinese coolies were recruited under the terms of this advertisement.

I beg also to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies on whose authority the advertisement in the *Chinese Times* of 29th March last, relating to the terms of engagement of the Chinese coolies, was drawn up and inserted; and whether he will have the advertisement at once withdrawn, and advertisements issued which will give a full and truthful statement of the conditions of contract.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cvii., 425.

‡ See (4) *Debates*, cxxxvi., 1237.

§ See (4) *Debates*, cxxxi., 636.

MR. CHARLES ALLEN (Gloucestershire, Stroud): At the same time may I ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been called to advertisements in the Chinese language, which have been recently circulated in the provinces of Shantung and Chihli, inviting coolies to go to South Africa, which do not inform them that they will have to work underground in the deep levels, do not inform them that they will have to live in a compound, which make no mention of the system of fines and penalties incurred by those leaving the compounds without leave, and which give the wages to be paid in pounds and not in dollars; and, if so, what steps the Government propose to take to prevent the circulation of such advertisements.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. LYTTELTON, Warwick and Leamington): My attention has not been called to this advertisement, and if any coolies were recruited under it, they must have had the conditions of the contract fully explained to them before they signed it. With reference to the hon. Member's second Question on this subject, I am not aware by whose authority this advertisement was issued, but it was apparently drawn up before the conditions were finally settled, and if it has not been long since withdrawn I will certainly at once direct that this shall be done.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: Will the right hon. Gentleman make inquiry if the original advertisement did contain the conditions; and if any coolies were actually recruited under it, and will he state what action will be taken with regard to coolies obviously recruited under misstatements.

[No Answer was returned.]

Beri-beri in the Transvaal.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is yet able to state the cause and extent of the outbreak of beri-beri among the Chinese coolies engaged for the Transvaal, and the methods adopted to prevent its spread.

MR. LYTTELTON: Lord Milner has telegraphed: "Tweeddale arrived with forty cases of beri-beri. Three deaths took place at sea from this cause, and five at Durban. Remaining cases were sent back to China at once in Tweeddale. Since arrival of labourers on Rand twenty-five cases have occurred, and one death from heart failure. All remaining cases isolated in lazaretto and likely to recover. Neither medical officers nor labourers themselves have smallest anxiety about this outbreak, and former express opinion that general health of this batch is surprisingly good. Full report on arrival, landing, and despatch of coolies will go to you by next mail and I will keep you fully informed as to their health."

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: Will an inquiry be made into the cause of the outbreak?

MR. LYTTELTON: The hon. Member had better put that Question down. No doubt an inquiry has been made.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): Will the right hon. Gentleman give us the date of the despatch of the telegram by Lord Milner, and the date of its receipt at the Colonial Office?

MR. LYTTELTON: I deal with that in answer to another Question.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can state the date upon which the first Chinese coolies arrived at Durban; the date upon which the first case of beri-beri broke out, and what steps, if any, were taken to combat the disease; also, the date upon which he telegraphed to Lord Milner for information upon these matters; and what has been the result of his inquiry.

MR. LYTTELTON: The Tweeddale arrived at Durban on the 18th inst. I am not aware of the date on which the disease broke out, but only that three deaths took place at sea. I telegraphed to Lord Milner on the 23rd instant, but the telegram was written and settled on the 22nd, and I was informed that it was despatched on the morning of that day.

It was, however, by an accident not despatched till the 23rd. I again telegraphed to Lord Milner on the 25th and 27th. As to the other points referred to in the hon. and gallant Member's Question, I must refer him to the telegram which I have just read.

DR. MACNAMARA: What was the date of the dispatch by Lord Milner of his telegram?

MR. LYTTELTON: I saw it for the first time this morning. I believe it arrived last night, but I cannot say with certainty.

DR. MACNAMARA: I will put another Question.

The Landing of Coolies at Durban.

DR. MACNAMARA: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he is now in a position to make a statement on the circumstances attending the landing at Durban, under armed surveillance, of Chinese coolies indentured under the Transvaal Ordinance.

MR. LYTTELTON: No, Sir. As I have already intimated, Lord Milner has promised a report by mail.

DR. MACNAMARA: May I ask whether the right hon. Gentleman, as promised, has requested Lord Milner for a reply by cable to this Question?

MR. LYTTELTON: I do not recollect having promised to ask for a cabled reply. Will the hon. Gentleman quote my words?

DR. MACNAMARA: It was in reply to a Question by the hon. Member for Poplar.

*MR. SPEAKER: It is not in order to discuss a Question and Answer given on a previous day.

DR. MACNAMARA: I desire to know whether Lord Milner was requested by cable to send the report as the Colonial Secretary promised on Thursday.

MR. LYTTELTON: I thought the hon. Member was asking whether I applied for a telegraphic reply. I did not ask by cable for a report by mail.

Present number of Chinese Coolies in South Africa.

DR. MACNAMARA: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies how many Chinese coolies—men, women, and children—have arrived in South Africa up to date.

MR. LYTTELTON: I have not been as yet informed by Lord Milner of the numbers which have arrived. They are stated in the newspapers to be rather more than 1,000.

DR. MACNAMARA: Will the right hon. Gentleman secure from Lord Milner information as to the number respectively of men, women, and children?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs): By cable.

MR. LYTTELTON: I have not received the numbers.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: Does the 1,000 already there include any women or children?

*MR. SPEAKER: If these particulars are wanted they should have been asked for.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: They are asked for, Sir.

DR. MACNAMARA: I have asked for the number of men, women, and children, and now I ask the right hon. Gentleman if he will get that information from Lord Milner.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. Gentleman will look at the way the Question is printed he will see that what he asked for was the total number of Chinese coolies, and then in brackets were the words "men, women, and children." He has not asked for them separately.

DR. MACNAMARA rose to put a further Question, but was met with shouts of "Order!"

*MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. Gentleman wishes to have separate figures they should be asked for. It is quite obvious that a Minister cannot bring down all these separate figures unless he is asked for them.

DR. MACNAMARA: I have definitely asked for specific figures.

*MR. SPEAKER: I did not so read it, and it seems that the Colonial Secretary did not so read it.

DR. MACNAMARA: Very well, Sir, I will put it down in a more specific form.

South African Constabulary.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies what was the original intention of His Majesty's Government as to the strength of the South African Constabulary; and what is the present strength.

MR. LYTTELTON: The intention was to have a police force of six thousand men. The present authorised strength is 5,000. The actual strength is for the moment rather less. Lord Milner is satisfied that a force of 5,000 is adequate for police purposes.

Sale of Intoxicating Liquor and Drugs in India.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that the number of shops open for the sale of intoxicating liquor and drugs in India rose from 97,910 in 1901–2 to 99,497 in 1902–3; that the net revenue on liquor and drugs consumed in India for the year 1902–3 was £4,741,000, an increase of £502,000 on the figures for 1900–1; and that in the last financial statement of the Government of India a further increase of £498,800 is anticipated during the current year; and whether he is in a position to explain the reasons for this increase in the number of shops opened and the consequent increase in consumption.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): The increase in the number of shops was considerable only in the two provinces of Bengal and the Central Provinces. In Bengal it was chiefly due to the fact that many shops sanctioned but unlet in 1901–2 were let in 1902–3; and in the Central Provinces to the Government taking over the Excise arrangements in certain semi-feudatory areas and to the consequent more strict enforcement of the law. As the increase of revenue in 1902–3 over 1901–2 in these two provinces was not marked, the additional shops could not have had much effect on consumption.

Concessions to the East Africa Syndicate.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the East Africa Syndicate has exercised any of the rights or options secured to it on the concessions which appear as granted to it in the White Paper, 2nd April, of 1903; whether this syndicate has been granted subsequently any further concessions in Uganda and East Africa either in regard to minerals or land; and, if so, what is their scope, and what consideration has been received for them; and whether any company or syndicate has been granted, since the above White Paper was laid upon the Table of the House, any land, or property, or mining concessions; and, if so, what is their nature, and what are the names of the concessionaires.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl PERCY, Kensington, S.): The only agreements actually concluded with the East Africa Syndicate are for leases of land, particulars of which will be found in the Papers shortly to be laid before Parliament. These Returns will, it is hoped, also give all the desired information in regard to concessions generally both in East Africa and Uganda.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Will these agreements be subject to ratification by Parliament or are they final?

EARL PERCY; They do not require ratification by Parliament.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Then they are final?

EARL PERCY: Yes.

Finance Regulations—Issues from the Consolidated Fund.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the issues from the Consolidated Fund for Supply Services are governed by the provisions of The Exchequer and Audit Departments Act, 1866, or whether the provisions of any later Act apply; whether the money granted by a Consolidated Fund Act to meet the expenditure authorised by Resolutions in Supply for Civil Services can, under any circumstances, be used for Army or Navy Services; whether the money granted by Consolidated Fund Act, No. 1, of this session for Naval Services is available to meet the expenditure authorised by Resolutions in Supply for Naval Services since the passing of that Act, and is the only money so available; and how much of the money so granted remains unissued up to the present time.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.): The issues for Supply Services are made in accordance with the provisions of the Exchequer and Audit Departments Act, 1866, and of Section 2 (1) of the Public Accounts and Charges Act, 1891. The money granted by a Consolidated Fund Act is not allocated to any particular head of Supply Services, unless the Act be also an Appropriation Act. The Consolidated Fund (No. 1) Act of the present session authorised the issue of the sum of £39,571,200, to be applied "towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905." The Act does not allocate the money between the various Supply Services, and it will not be so allocated until the Appropriation Act is passed. The unissued balance under the Consolidated Fund (No. 1) Act is £15,521,500, and that balance can be made available for any Votes which the House has granted, either before or since the passing of the Act, for Army, Navy, or Civil Services.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: The right hon. Gentleman has quoted the Public Accounts and Charges Act. Is he aware that under that Act issues are restricted to making good the Supply that was granted at the time of the last issue? Is that consistent with his present Answer?

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I think the hon. Gentlemen had better put that Question down.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: May I give notice that I propose to call attention to this matter on Report of Supply, when perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will take the opportunity to explain more fully the exact consequences of the present position.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I think I have given all the information that is in my power subject to the point raised by the hon. Member for Lynn Regis.

The New Taxes.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the new taxes proposed in the Finance Bill now under the consideration of the House are already being enforced by the collecting Departments; whether this is in accordance with the usual practice; and whether there is any legal authority for such a practice.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Answer to the first two paragraphs is in the affirmative. The authority for the practice is its long existence and its recognition in a succession of Budget Acts. It further obtained special recognition by 39 and 40 Vict., Chap. 36, Section 18.

Workmen's Compensation for Accidents Act Amendment Bill.

Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will state when he proposes to introduce the Bill to amend the Workmen's Compensation for Accidents Act; and whether any endeavour will be made to pass the Bill this session.

The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Cochrane, Ayrshire, N.): As I have already intimated in reply to a previous Question from the hon. Member,† I can make no definite statement as to the date of the introduction of the Bill until I have received and considered the Report of the Committee which has been inquiring into the subject. I understand that the Committee have found the inquiry more laborious than was anticipated, but they have now been at work for some time on their Report, and I hope it may be in my hands within the next few weeks.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxiii., 531.

Rattigan's Estate, Edgeworthstown.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what steps the authorities intend taking in the execution of decrees on the estate of Mr. Rattigan, of Camlirk House, Edgeworthstown; whether he is aware that the tenants have declared their intention to resist the execution by every means in their power; and whether, in the interest of the peace of the district, he will refuse to lend the forces of the Crown to carry out these executions.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): This is a small property, the rental of which is considerably below the Poor Law valuation. There are twenty-one tenants, all of whom, except four, have paid their rents. Civil bill decrees have been obtained against the latter. If protection is requisitioned for their execution it will, of course, be afforded.

Mrs. Ledwith's Estate, County Longford.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is prepared to advise the Estates Commissioners to purchase for striping amongst tenants of Currool-Fox, Currool Kenny, and Currool Brennan the farm of Dernageas, in the barony of Rathclive, county Longford, on the estate of Mrs. Harriett Ledwith, whose agent is Mr. Webb, Corngard, Boyle, county Roscommon; whether he is aware that the landlady is willing and anxious to sell this farm for the benefit of the tenants; and whether, as Newtowncashel parish, in which this farm is situate, may be described as a congested district, he will advise the Estates Commissioners to expend money on the reclamation, fencing, and division of this farm.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Estates Commissioners have not received any application from the owner of this estate. Should it be offered to the Commissioners they will consider the question of its improvement and division.

Irish Agricultural Organisation Society.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what is the annual amount paid to the Irish Agricultural Organisation Society by the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction; and what was the amount of the last payment, and to whom was it made.

MR. WYNDHAM: No fixed annual grant is paid. The Department occasionally utilises the services of some of the Society's officers who have expert qualifications in such subjects as egg packing, poultry rearing, fruit growing, and bee keeping; and they also use the services of two of the Society's organisers in connection with the organisation of Agricultural Banks. The total amount paid by the Department to the Society in this connection in the year ended 31st March last, was £4,262 3s. 6d. The last payment, one of £100, was made on the 18th instant.

MR. MURPHY: Having regard to the fact that this organisation is competing unfairly with similar organisations——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The Question on the Paper has been fully answered, and the hon. Member is now seeking to raise an entirely fresh point.

Party Demonstrations in Ulster.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, with a view of preventing breaches of the peace at forthcoming demonstrations in some districts in Ulster, he will take steps to prevent the holding of such demonstrations.

MR. WYNDHAM: The steps hitherto adopted for the maintenance of the public peace on such occasions will continue to be followed.

Irish Department of Agriculture—Officers' Salaries and Travelling Expenses

Mr. MURPHY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what is the amount estimated for 1904–5 for new officers appointed under the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction, and the sum required to cover travelling expenses for same; and what is the additional amount that will be required for salaries and expenses of transferred officers.

Mr. WYNDHAM: For the salaries of new officers appointed since the establishment of the Department a sum of £25,469 is provided. The provision for their travelling expenses and subsistence allowances amounts to £5,050. In respect of officers transferred to the Department the provision for salaries amounts to £47,335, and for travelling and other allowances £2,950.

Woodwork Instruction in Irish Schools.

Mr. J. F. X. O'BRIEN (Cork): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland how long it will take to train the twenty young men recently selected by the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) for admission to the course of instruction in the manual training (woodwork) so as to qualify them to give instruction in woodwork, as itinerant instructors under county schemes, in the technical schools which are now being organised throughout Ireland, or in day secondary schools, under the conditions of the Department's regulations for such schools; how long will it take the instructors so trained to impart adequate instruction to the boys and girls in the Irish schools; is the Department considering how best to utilise the acquirements of the children so trained; whether, considering the lack of enterprise in Ireland, steps will be taken for employing the trained children in various industries; whether the Department has power to initiate such industries; and, if not, whether he will consider the desirability of giving such power to the Department, or to some other body.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The course of training for these teachers will last six months. The time limits of the course to be given to pupils by the instructors when trained must necessarily vary according to circumstances. The object of the courses is educational, *i.e.*, to form habits which will be of value to the pupils whatever may be their subsequent career in life. As regards the latter part of the Question, the Department's function with respect to industries other than those specified in Section 30 (1) of the Act of 1899, is to provide assistance by means of technical instruction, and to afford information and expert advice.

Kingston Estate.

Mr. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state whether any application has yet been made to the Estates Commissioners to declare a section of the Kingston Estate to be a separate estate, the tenants on such portion having been induced to sign agreements for purchase; whether he is aware that processes for payment of a year's rent have been issued against other tenants who, finding themselves unable to accept the landlord's terms, have refused to sign agreements; and if the Estates Commissioners will investigate the circumstances of the tenants on this estate, before creating any section of it a separate estate, or sanctioning advances for purchase of holdings on a portion of it.

Mr. WYNDHAM: No application has been received by the Commissioners in reference to any portion of this estate. If made all the circumstances will be considered.

Constables' Lodging-out Allowances at Millstreet.

Mr. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state what are the results of his inquiries in o the lodging-out allowances granted to seven members of the Royal Irish Constabulary stationed at Millstreet, notwithstanding that there should be a sufficiency of accommodation for them in the barracks; and, seeing that Millstreet and Ballyvourney were formerly included in the Macroom police district, will he consider the desirability of again attaching them to that station, and thus effect a substantial economy.

Mr. WYNDHAM: There is no accommodation for married men at the Millstreet barracks. The district inspector resides in one portion of the building. The nine remaining apartments are occupied by eight men. The question of abolishing the station as a district headquarters will be considered hereafter; at present it is considered premature to discontinue the station.

Arbitrator's Award for Land for Labourers' Cottages in the Castleblayney Union.

Mr. McKEAN (Monaghan, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been called to an award, dated the 30th March last, made by Mr. Lawder, of Ballinamore, in his capacity as arbitrator, appointed by the Local Government Board, in the case of a proposed erection of cottages under the Labourers Acts in the Castleblayney union, in which award he allowed the owners the sum of £18 for ninety statute perches (an amount equal to thirty years purchase), at the same time reducing the occupier's rent by the sum of 12s., in addition to allowing said occupier £8 10s. for his interest, and £1 5s. for severance; and whether, seeing that Mr. Robert Haire, arbitrator on a former occasion, allowed the same owners only £11 5s. for a similar sized plot in the same field, he will take steps to secure that Mr. Lawder, being himself a landlord, shall not be employed as an arbitrator in such cases.

Mr. WYNDHAM: Mr. Lawder made his award on the basis of the facts deposed to by the claimant, and not disputed by the representatives of the district council who were present, namely, that he, the claimant, had, in respect of the plot, received £9 compensation at the former arbitration, and an abatement of 12s. in his rent. Mr. Lawder is confident his award is right. He is a very extensive farmer, a small landowner, and a civil engineer of much experience and high qualifications, fully competent to decide such matters. The reply to the last query is in the negative.

Mr. McKEAN: I must say the answer is not satisfactory. [Cries of "Order."] Is the right hon. Gentleman not aware that the amount awarded was £18, not £9.

Mr. WYNDHAM: My information is that it was £9.

Inspection of Weights and Measures—Ballymahan Grievance.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can explain the action of Sergeant M'Gettrick, of the Royal Irish Constabulary force at Ballymahan, in requiring traders in that town to send in their weights and measures to be tested on a market day, thus inconveniencing these persons; and will a caution be sent to the sergeant to select a less inconvenient time on future occasions.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The sergeant adjusted weights and measures on various dates between the 11th and 23rd June. Two of these days were market days, on which nine traders sent in their weights. No complaints of inconvenience were made, and the nine traders in question might have sent in their weights on six other appointed days which were not market days.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: If this is the practice of the sergeant, will the right hon. Gentleman direct him to choose other days?

Mr. WYNDHAM: I think it can hardly be described as his practice.

Millstreet Police—Lodging Allowances.

Mr. SHEEHAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that there are seven married constables stationed in Millstreet in receipt of lodging allowances, and that one of these resides in the police barrack; and, if so, will he state under what rule or order he receives a lodging allowance.

Mr. WYNDHAM: Two of the married constables at Millstreet in receipt of the lodging allowance live in barracks, although their families are accommodated outside. The allowance of 2s. a week is payable under the rules of the force for the families of married men not accommodated in barracks.

Upkeep of Banks on Sir R. Blennerhassett's Killorglin Estate.

Mr. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Irish Land Commission is responsible for the upkeep of the banks on the estate of Sir R. Blennerhassett, Douglas, Killorglin, Kerry, purchased by the tenants in 1886; if not, who is responsible; whether he is aware that the tenants on the estate have suffered loss and inconvenience during the past twelve months from the inflow of the tide; and whether steps will at once be taken to have the tenants' property protected.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The Commissioners recently directed an inspector to visit the embankment in question. The inspector's report was received yesterday, and will be considered by the Commissioners.

Irish Assistant Teachers' Pay.

Mr. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, considering the work done by assistant teachers in Irish national schools and the remuneration they get for their services, he will place on the Estimate a sum of £8,000, the amount calculated to give assistants of ten years service, and classed under old rules, second or higher second grade salary.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I can hold out no hope that this suggestion will be adopted. There is no analogy between the proposal and the reduction to fifty of the average required for an assistant teacher, the cost of which it is proposed to place on the Development Grant Estimate. Under the existing rules increases of income are awarded to teachers as the result of continued good service, and the adopting of the hon. Member's proposal would be opposed to the principle underlying the new system of payments.

Upkeep of Embankments on Estates adjoining the Sea.

Mr. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland when estates adjoining the sea, the banks of which before sale were kept in order by the landlord, are sold to the tenants, what authority will be responsible for the proper upkeep of those banks during the next sixty-eight and a half years.

Mr. WYNDHAM: In cases not coming within Section 4 of the Land Act of 1903 the tenant purchasers should keep up these embankments for their own protection. There is no obligation on the landlord or the State to do so.

Belfast Smallpox Outbreak.

Mr. JOSEPH DEVLIN (Kilkenny, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that recently there has been a serious outbreak of smallpox in the City of Belfast; whether he can furnish any particulars as to the cause and extent of the outbreak; whether his attention has been called to the neglect of the Belfast City Council to ensure an efficient exercise of its powers under the Public Health Acts, and the custom sanctioned by the council of permitting all kinds of refuse to be dumped on ground intended for building purposes; whether he is aware that a number of cottages abutting on the workhouse cemetery in Donegal Road, Belfast, where upwards of ten thousand have been interred, are overcrowded and without any system of drainage; and whether, under the circumstances, he will bring pressure to bear upon the city council in order to secure an immediate remedy for this state of affairs.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The total number of cases admitted to the smallpox hospital is ninety-three. Two have died; fifty-five have been discharged; and thirty-six remain under treatment. The disease is supposed to have been introduced from Scotland. The Belfast Corporation, in the opinion of the Local Government Board, efficiently discharges the duties devolving upon it as the sanitary authority. Every effort is being made to prevent the further spread of the disease. No complaints have been made to the Board in respect to the alleged dumping of refuse or the overcrowding of cottages.

Constable Anderson, Royal Irish Constabulary.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state what communication had passed between Sir Antony MacDonnell and the Rev. Denis O'Hara, with reference to the Anderson case prior to Sir Antony MacDonnell's official approval of Anderson's dismissal on 23rd January, 1904; and through what channels.

MR. WYNDHAM: Except on one occasion, no communications, verbal or written, with reference to the case of Constable Anderson passed, prior to his dismissal, between Sir Antony MacDonnell and the Rev. Denis O'Hara, who is, I should like to say, an esteemed colleague of my own on the Congested Districts Board, for whose services and character I have a warm regard. This was the occasion: At a meeting of the Congested Districts Board, Father O'Hara informed Sir Antony MacDonnell that he had applied for the removal from Kiltimagh of a constable, and asked him to look into the matter. Sir Antony MacDonnell replied that he would inquire from the Inspector-General on the subject. He did inquire from the Deputy Inspector-General—the Inspector-General being on leave at the time—what the matter was about. He was informed that a Court of Inquiry had been, or was being, appointed by the Inspector-General. Sir Antony MacDonnell heard nothing further in the case until the Inspector-General's recommendation that Anderson should be dismissed came before him in the usual official course.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what additional evidence of Constable Anderson's innocence, if any, was obtained between the date of the letter of 23rd January, approved of by Sir Antony MacDonnell, confirming his dismissal from the force, and the date of his reinstatement; and, if no such additional evidence was forthcoming, did Sir Antony MacDonnell concur in Anderson's reinstatement without it.

MR. WYNDHAM: Sir, I would refer my hon. friend to many previous replies given by me on the 13th, 15th, and 20th June,† and to the opinion which I have expressed, and now repeat, viz., that if further debate on this question is desired by my hon. friend, or any other hon. Member, it can be conducted more conveniently on the Vote for my salary than by way of Question and Answer. I should be glad of an opportunity to defend the exercise of my discretion and the action of the Inspector-General, if these are attacked; and to repudiate charges against Sir Antony MacDonnell and the Rev. Denis O'Hara if these are preferred. That opportunity is not to be found within the limitations of separate replies to a series of argumentative Questions; and I must respectfully decline to continue this controversy except by way of debate in Committee of Supply under conditions which would admit of my dealing fully with the whole matter.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN: On behalf of the hon. Member for East Mayo I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the district inspector and sergeant at Rossport, county Mayo, were asked to report on Constable Anderson's record while he was stationed there; and, if so, what was the nature of their reports.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have given very fully all the grounds upon which the Inspector-General, Sir N. Chamberlain, recommended the dismissal of this constable, and all the grounds upon which I recommended his reinstatement. They were confined in each case to specific charges preferred in connection with Constable Anderson's conduct when stationed at Kiltimagh. It would not, in my opinion, be proper for me to enlarge that issue now by taking note of other matters or allegations unconnected with those charges. But, in any case, I must respectfully decline to discuss the existence or character of confidential instructions and reports on matters of discipline in the Royal Irish Constabulary.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN: On behalf of the hon. Member for East Mayo, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, when constable Anderson was removed from Rossport to Mullaghmore, the police at these stations got instructions to note every time Constable Anderson was seen in the neighbourhood of Rossport.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxv., 1497, cxxxvi., 147, 486.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I must respectfully decline to discuss the existence or character of confidential instructions.

Inquiry into the Incidence of Taxation.

Mr. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will assent to the Motion for a Select Committee to inquire into the Incidence of Taxation standing on this day's Paper.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.): I doubt whether any useful purpose would be served by appointing a Select Committee with regard to this matter. It is an extremely complex problem, and I do not think that a Select Committee would advance it further than the learned professors who have already dealt with it have been able to do. It is my personal belief that when a strictly scientific question of this kind has to be investigated the appointment of a Select Committee is an indifferent way of arriving at an agreement.

Mr. CHANNING: Do I understand the right hon. Gentleman dissents from the proposal to have an inquiry, whether by Select Committee or in any other way? Does he not accept the principle of inquiry?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: It is not a question of principle but of expediency. So far as I can see, very little would be gained by an inquiry. Nothing would be learned from it except what can now be learned by any patient student of economic theory.

The Motion referred to is as follows:—Incidence of Taxation: That a Select Committee be appointed to consider the relative incidence of Imperial Taxation on the various Classes and Incomes of the Population, and to report what readjustments are possible and advisable, with a view to secure that the contributions of all Classes and Incomes shall be more exactly proportioned to their taxable capacity.

Blocking Motions.

Mr. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he proposes to take steps to restore to the House that full freedom of discussing urgent matters of public importance of which it has now been largely deprived owing to the operation of Motions placed on the Paper with the design of preventing such discussion.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I cannot say that in the matter of Motions for adjournment I have seen any extraordinary restriction on the use of the privileges of the House during the last few weeks. With regard to the Question on the Paper, I have more than once answered Questions of precisely similar import, and I have nothing to add to what I have already said.

Mr. JOHN ELLIS: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that there is a Motion down which prevents a discussion even of the question of blocking Motions.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: We might have blocking Motion on blocking Motion *ad infinitum*. I do not see how the House could with advantage discuss the question of blocking Motions except in reference to some proposed amendment of the Standing Orders, and I have already explained that I do not propose in the present session to bring before the House any Rule dealing with the general question.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that there is nothing in the Standing Orders relating to this matter? It is a question of the general practice of the House. Is the right hon. Gentleman prepared to give time for the discussion of a Resolution which would correct the practice of the House in order to avoid these blocking methods?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: There may be nothing in the Standing Orders, but it would require a Standing Order to correct the common practice of the House, and I do not think it would be desirable to give a day for such a discussion in the present state of public business.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): But the right hon. Gentleman has indicated his willingness to remove the effect of blocking Motions from Motions for adjournment for the holidays and other occasions of that kind. Will he say whether he will be able to bring forward a scheme for that purpose during the present session?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I could not find time for such a Motion unless it is passed with the general assent of the House and without discussion.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Will the right hon. Gentleman put such a proposal on the Paper, so that the House may judge whether it can agree to it?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes, I think that is a very fair request.

Mr. LABOUCHERE: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will grant an opportunity to the Member for Coventry to bring forward the Motion that stands in his name in regard to labour in Africa. I beg to say I put this Question direct to the right hon. Gentleman at the special request of the hon. Member for Coventry.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR. My view is that of all subjects which the House has shown its desire to discuss, this, perhaps, is the one which has been most fully discussed during the course of the present session, and when I remember that it can be again debated on the Colonial Vote, it seems to me that it will be impossible for the Government so far to violate ordinary practice as to give a special opportunity for discussing a private Member's Resolution upon it.

The Finance Bill.

Mr. WHITLEY (Halifax): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can now state when the consideration of the Finance Bill will be resumed.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: We shall not finish the Committee stage of the Finance Bill until we come to the concluding stage of the Licensing Bill.

Mr. WHITLEY: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the trade concerned is completely at a standstill meantime, and does he really propose to allow that state of things to go on for five weeks.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I hope things are not so bad as the hon. Gentleman seems to suggest. If they are I hope he will give us his sedulous and earnest support in hurrying matters forward.

Mr. BUCHANAN: Is there any precedent for postponing the Committee stage of the Finance Bill to the end of July.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I have not looked up the precedents.

DEAN FOREST BILL.

Reported, from the Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 233.]

Bill, as amended, re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House for Friday, and to be printed. [Bill 247.]

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Mr. Halsey reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Members from the Standing Committee on Law, and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure; Mr. Colston and Mr. Shackleton; and had appointed in substitution, Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree and Dr. Shipman.

Report to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC PETITIONS COMMITTEE.

Ninth Report brought up, and read; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Leave given to the Committee to make a Special Report.

Special Report brought up, and read.

Special Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 234.]

LICENSING BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 1:—

Amendment again proposed—

"In page 1, line 7, after the words 'ill-conducted' to insert the words 'or for not having provided suitable refreshment'."—*Mr. Herbert Roberts.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple) said he understood that the Solicitor-General desired to substitute the following words for those in the Amendment under the consideration of the Committee—

"(2) "If the justices of a licensing district refuse to renew an on-licence on the ground that the holder of the licence has persistently and unreasonably refused to supply suitable refreshment (other than intoxicating liquor) the justices shall be deemed to have refused the licence on the ground that the premises have been ill-conducted."

He could only say that he hoped that the hon. Member for West Denbighshire would not withdraw his Amendment in favour of that of the Government; the substitution would be entirely unsatisfactory, and would give one test as to the *bona fides* of the Government in proposing it. They said that they intended to give power to the justices to take away a licence. This was the important point. They said the licence could be taken away under certain conditions. What did the Home Secretary say upon the subject the previous night? He said that to take away a licence under such circumstances would be to place upon the licensee an absolutely intolerable penalty; but, if the Amendment were to be taken as a really working Amendment, this was what he now intended to do. The fact of the matter was he knew perfectly well that the introduction of the word "persistently" made all the difference, because they would never be able to get evidence and prove it. By refusing the original Amendment they would be decidedly crippling the power of the magistrates. The magistrates now had power to refuse a licence in the event of reasonable refreshment not being supplied and he admitted that they had identically the same power under the Bill providing compensation were paid; but what would be the position if the compensation fund were exhausted, as it easily might be? There were many districts in the country in which there were a very large number of licences indeed and in which it was necessary to make a very large reduction at the earliest date. Under the Bill it was possible that the annual levy would be capitalised and a good many of these houses done away with. What would be the position of the licences that remained after they had exhausted their compensation fund? They would be in the position of the 1869 beerhouses. They could not be taken away except under the conditions of Clause 1 and under the condition which the Solicitor-General had put down in his Amendment. The Amendment was a most important one, because they had to consider whether they were going to give 1869 terms to a large number of licences in the country. He sincerely trusted the hon. Member would persist in his Amendment; if he did, he for one should certainly vote for it.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said the Committee seemed to be agreed as to the desirability of carrying some Amendment on this point, and he would, therefore, confine his observations to the suggestion of the Solicitor-General. He hoped the hon. and learned Gentleman would improve his Amendment by withdrawing the word "persistently." That was the word to which they took most exception. The Government had put two very strong expressions in their Amendment "persistently" and "unreasonably." Surely the latter was quite enough. If the publican desired to prove that the refreshment was demanded at an unusual hour or that he had run out of the articles asked for, it could not be laid down that he had acted unreasonably. He was bound to say that in his opinion the Government had gone a good way to meet the Amendment proposed from that side of the House, and he hoped that they would go a step further and drop the word "persistently."

SIR ROBERT REID (Dumfries Burghs) was of opinion that the Solicitor-General's Amendment would afford a basis on which this point could be discussed, but it did not remove the difficulty he had. Personally he thought the word "persistently" was open to very serious objection. The Amendment before the Committee was only an illustration of a considerable number of other cases in which the effect of Clause 1 was not merely to safeguard licensees against having their property taken away, but to relax the disciplinary jurisdiction which had hitherto been exercised by the justices. If they took away the right to suppress licences without compensation, they must make it perfectly clear that the right to obtain compensation was limited to the cases in which it was wished that compensation should be given. If the Government insisted on the present wording of the clause, they must not merely say that the refusal to provide refreshment was misconduct, but they must say a great many more things. They must use such words as would enable that kind of pressure which in the public interest had always been exercised to continue to be exercised in the future.

MAJOR JAMESON (Clare, W.) declared that the aim of the supporters of the Amendment was already secured under the Innkeepers' Liability Act. He noticed that there were eighty-eight pages of the Amendments to the Bill, and he ventured to assert that anyone going through them could reduce the number of the Amendments which really required discussion to eight. He protested against the delay which was occasioned by the discussion of this Amendment and similar Amendments, the sole object of which was to wreck the Bill.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid.) said the hon. Member who last spoke evidently was not aware of the circumstances which led to Progress being reported on the preceding night. It was the debate which had then been going on for some hours which made it absolutely necessary for the Solicitor-General to bring in his Amendment. He thought the word "persistently" in the Solicitor-General's Amendment was very objectionable as fettering the discretion of the magistrates, and that Clause 8, which dealt with definitions, was the wrong place to introduce it. If it was inserted in Clause 8, they would be practically giving a definition of the word "ill-conducted," and limiting the discretion of the justices as to what was or was not misconduct. They must not be content with a partial definition; they must, if they mentioned one point, enumerate other actions which would amount to misconduct, otherwise there was a danger that the Courts of Law would consider themselves fettered in this matter. As the general feeling of the House of Commons was clearly in favour of this Amendment, he trusted that the Government would agree to deal with the point in the clause now under consideration.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.) appealed to the Committee to bring the discussion to an end. He thought everybody would admit that the pledge given by his right hon. and learned friend had been honestly met by the Amendment which he had put down to Clause 8. He did not believe that hon. Gentlemen opposite concurred with the criticisms of the hon. Member for Barnstaple when he attacked the *bona fides* of the Government; indeed, he did not think the hon. Member himself would seriously question the *bona fides* of his right hon. and learned friend. The hon. and learned Gentleman who had just sat down said that Clause 8 was not the place for the Amendment, and suggested that when a case came before the licensing magistrates or before quarter sessions some lawyer would be found to get up and say that the Government had intended in Clause 8 to give a complete and exhaustive definition of what constituted misconduct. Well, he put no limits to what might be urged by counsel in various cases; but no tribunal of any description, in reading Clause 8 as his right hon. and learned friend proposed to amend it, would for a moment suggest that the whole area of misconduct was exhausted by it, or was intended by the Government or the House to be exhausted by it.

SIR ROBERT REID said there was a rule in law that general words were very often limited by special words following after, and then the principle of *ejusdem generis* was applied.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he was not qualified to contend with the hon. and learned Gentleman upon matters which were purely legal; he admitted the premises, but wholly denied the conclusion. That any Court would suggest that this question of misconduct was fully explained, limited, and exhausted by a provision about soda water and bread, was a proposition which the hon. and learned Gentleman would hardly entertain. He did not believe the danger was a genuine one. The Government were clearly of the opinion that the Amendment would be better on Clause 8, and he hoped, therefore, the Committee would proceed to the next Amendment.

Sir EDWARD GREY (Northumberland, Berwick) thought nobody would dispute that the Solicitor-General had acted with perfect *bona fides* in putting down his Amendmemt to meet the particular Amendment that was under discussion yesterday. But in the course of that discussion it was discovered that a very serious point underlay this Amendment, of which the Amendment was only an illustration. What had given real life to the debate, and caused the intervention of the right hon. Member for West Birmingham and the hon. and learned Member for Stretford, was the fact that the clause was doing what it was understood the Bill was not intended to do. The first clause as it stood destroyed the elasticity of discretion which the magistrates had had hitherto. That elasticity could not be restored by giving a special bit of elasticity on a special subject in another clause. Such a proposal seemed to him not only inadequate, but positively dangerous. The first question which would arise would be, what was meant by misconduct? and he would ask the Committee to look at that from a common sense and not a lawyer's point of view. What they wanted was some elasticity of interpretation; they wanted the magistrates, in the matter of misconduct, to retain the elastic discretion they now possessed. The real difficulty which confronted them could only be dealt with on the first clause.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said he could not in the least follow the arguments of the hon. Baronet. Could they possibly find wider words than "ill-conducted." There was no kind of conduct which they did not cover. The hon. Baronet talked of the want of elasticity, but he defied him to ransack English and Scotch dictionaries and to find a larger and more elastic term than that. For his own part, he could not help thinking it was a great pity that the Government did not stand by these words, because he held that they left a most complete and most elastic discretion to the justices. The reasonable refusal of refreshment would not be ill-conduct, but unreasonable refusal was certainly covered by those words; and if a licensing justice chose to hold that the unreasonable refusal of refreshment was ill-conduct, he would have a right to refuse to renew the licence. Again, he did not think that Clause 8 was the proper place at which to insert such an Amendment in the Bill. He had not had time to carefully consider the Amendment of the Solicitor-General, but he must say he thought it was open to the serious objection that it imposed far too heavy a penalty for what, after all, might be a very small offence. Still he feared that a lower penalty could not be imposed in that Bill. It was a misfortune that an inappropriate penalty should be introduced. He would suggest that if hon. Gentlemen opposite wanted to leave the licensing justices in full enjoyment of their full authority, the words "ill-conduct" would suffice to cover any case. If hon. Gentlemen would take his advice—and he did not suppose they would on either side—both the hon. Member for West Denbighshire and the Solicitor-General would withdraw their Amendments.

Mr. BROADHURST (Leicester) feared that the Committee were getting away from the main point. The one object they had in view in bringing forward that Amendment was to ensure that there were adequate opportunities of securing at wayside inns refreshments other than intoxicating drinks. They wanted to have it provided that innkeepers should be bound by law, under a penalty, to provide coffee, tea, and other light refreshments. Why could not the Government agree to that? It would be equally good for the motorist as the cyclist. Why should not the Prime Minister when out motoring be enabled to get a cup of tea at a wayside inn? What was necessary was greater freedom of choice in the matter of refreshments when travelling along the King's highway. He was prepared to admit that the Solicitor-General had more than fulfilled his pledge of the preceding night. He had not merely considered the matter as he promised to do, but he had placed on the Paper an Amendment. Now, he asked, would the hon. and learned Gentleman and the Prime Minister agree to delete the word "persistently"? The keeping of that word in would destroy the value of the Amendment. Supposing a man travelling with his wife, his mother, or his sweetheart, was refused a cup of tea, how would it satisfy his thirst to be told that if the innkeeper refused it on two or three more occasions he would lose his licence. He would not be satisfied, but, on the other hand, he might suffer harm by being compelled to take drinks for which he had no liking. Why not agree to cut out the word "persistently"? The Solicitor-General, having got some distance on the road to reason and justice in this matter, should complete his journey by removing the obstacle presented by that word.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) said he did not quite agree with the hon. Member for King's Lynn. He thought it was desirable that the Solicitor-General should put on the Paper the words he would move to add to Clause 8. He was not dissatisfied with the words save in regard to "persistently." There were some other matters which would have to be dealt with later on, but when he remembered what happened in connection with promises made during the progress of the Education Bill, he was afraid that the "later on" might not arrive. He thought the Solicitor-General wanted to meet their views, and as he could do it without in the slightest degree imperilling the Bill or the power of the magistrates, he would ask why the Scotch precedent should not be followed, and the words "without prejudice to other powers" be inserted. He thought words of that kind ought to be introduced so as not to exclude the power of the magistrates in regard to other misconduct. He did not agree with his learned friend that it would exclude cases of drunkenness on the premises, but to prevent the possibility of any misinterpretation why not give the magistrates power to make bylaws on this subject. It seemed to him that the Scotch precedent was an excellent one. It gave the magistrates power to make by-laws in regard to the supply of provisions. They had a list of the public-houses in their district before them, and they would say that it was unfair to ask that certain public-houses should supply all kinds of refreshments, taking into consideration the fact that there would be no demand for them. In other cases the licensees would be called upon to provide reasonable refreshment. That would have the advantage of keeping the control of the magistrates over the public-houses. It was important not merely in regard to refreshments, for the publicans would know that if they did not conduct themselves in such a way as to commend themselves to the approval of the Licensing Bench, the Bench would, in that way, be able to bring pressure on them. He had not seen magistrates go out of their way to exercise unfair pressure on the occupiers of public-houses. Quite the reverse. It was really important if they were to have these houses properly conducted that the magistrates should have that power. The Scotch law gave the power to the magistrates to select public-houses and to give them a schedule of the kind of refreshments they ought to provide. That was what they wanted inserted in this Bill.

*Mr. DISRAELI (Cheshire, Altrincham) said that all on that side of the House were not unanimous in agreeing with the Amendment of which the Solicitor-General had given notice. There was a strong opinion that this question was altogether outside the scope of the Bill, the object of which was to reduce the number of licensed houses and to give compensation for that reduction. If they put an obligation of this stringent character upon publicans, it would have the effect of making their lot harder than it was at the present time. The publican's calling was a very difficult one, and he protested against the present proposal having even the sentimental sanction of the Government.

Mr. WHITTAKER (Yorkshire, W.R., Spen Valley) said he agreed to some extent with the hon. Member who had just spoken that it was an extraordinary thing that they were discussing refreshments, such as tea and coffee, on the clause of the Bill dealing with compensation. He thought that arose from the way in which the clause had been drafted. The clause did not state what were the cases in which compensation ought to be given; on the other hand it stated the cases in which the magistrates could refuse the renewal of licences. In that case, it was necessary to give all the cases in which a licence could be refused other than on the ground that the licence was not required. They understood that compensation was to be given on the ground that a licence was not required. They were satisfied that as the Bill now stood compensation would be given for the refusal of licences on other grounds than that, and if that were to be guarded against they must have all kinds of protection to preserve the power of the justices in other cases that would come within the limit of the words "ill-conducted." There was unsatisfactory management which could scarcely be called ill-conduct. The failure to supply refreshments was not a case of ill-conduct. There were other cases in which they ought to have the power to refuse to renew a licence and not to give any compensation. He thought the Government could do better by defining positively those cases in which compensation should be given and using some such words as "compensation should be given when a licence was refused solely on the ground that it was not required in the neighbourhood." The ingenuity of the Government would enable them to draft words that would fulfil that object. Failing that, there was a number of Amendments on the Paper which they were bound to discuss. The proper way out of the difficulty, he ventured to submit, was to make it clear that compensation was to be confined to cases where the refusal to renew a licence was on the ground that the licences were in excess of the number required in the neighbourhood.

Mr. Disraeli

Mr. WHITLEY (Halifax) said he would make an appeal to the Prime Minister on this matter. At Question time the right hon. Gentleman said that the progress of the Finance Bill might be promoted if the Committee would get on with this Bill. He would point out that if the right hon. Gentleman would accept the Amendment now before the Committee he would save the discussion of two pages of Amendments. He asked the Prime Minister simply to carry out the statement which was made on the First Reading of the Bill. It was stated then that the whole object of the Bill was to provide compensation when renewal of licences was refused solely on the ground that the public-houses in the neighbourhood were in excess of the number required. If the right hon. Gentleman would carry out that promise which was made by the Home Secretary he would greatly facilitate the work of the Committee in dealing with the first clause. It could not be said that there was any danger of the magistrates refusing licences or inflicting too great penalties for small offences, such as refusing refreshments, because their action was always subject to appeal to quarter sessions. There had never been a single case where a licence had been removed for one refusal to supply reasonable refreshments. He thought that was a matter which the local magistrates should be left to deal with. One of the most serious points in the whole Bill was the method of proceeding by exclusion instead of inclusion. It took away the power of the magistrates to bring pressure to bear in the case of ill-conduct on the part of the licensee. If the procedure suggested by the hon. Member for the Spen Valley Division and the hon. Member for Leeds were adopted they would get over the whole of the difficulty.

Mr. AUSTIN TAYLOR (Liverpool, E. Toxteth) said the Amendment only assumed importance because it raised the general question as to how far the words used in the first clause would limit the absolute discretion of the justices. He regretted the attempt made in the Amendment to further define what was already sufficiently defined in the first clause, and he equally regretted the

Amendment of which the Solicitor-General had given notice. He wished to give the Prime Minister a concrete instance of those minor matters which could not be called statutory offences, but had been made the subject of reform in Liverpool and other large centres. He would instance the case of what was called the "long pull" at Liverpool. There it was the practice at certain licensed houses to give a quantity of drink beyond that which was ordered.

*The CHAIRMAN said he thought the hon. Member was discussing the subject of some future Amendment.

Mr. AUSTIN TAYLOR said that he was trying to give an illustration of the kind of pressure which magistrates had been able to bring on the trade and to which the trade had loyally responded.

*The CHAIRMAN said he thought that subject would be relevant to a subsequent Amendment dealing with "undesirable practices."

Mr. AUSTIN TAYLOR said he would not give additional illustrations, but would content himself with emphasising the need for further consideration by the Government of the exact wording of the first clause. No doubt the absolute discretion of the magistrates must be modified if the principle of compensation were conceded; but there was no need to go so far as to weaken their legitimate control over the trade.

*Mr. JOSEPH WALTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley) said that it was of the highest degree of importance that the obligation resting on innkeepers to provide a supply of food as well as liquor to travellers should not be weakened; and it appeared to him that the Amendment put down by the Solicitor-General weakened the present authority of the licensing authorities in that respect. It was widely recognised that there was great laxity on the part of innkeepers in the fulfilment of this particular obligation of supplying food as well as intoxicating liquors. A few days ago he took a lovely country walk, and, having gone a reasonable distance, he thought he was sure to pass an hotel where he could get a comfortable luncheon. He came to one where there was a large notice-board outside, saying that luncheons were provided on the shortest notice; teas always ready; and pleasure parties catered for. He went in, and asked if he could get luncheon. The bar was full of people drinking, and the waiter said, "We have nothing in." He said, "Cannot you give me a bit of bread and cheese?" "No," was the answer, "we have nothing, but if you cross the river, and go a little bit further on, you will find a hotel, and perhaps you might get something to eat there." He crossed the river; and reached that other hotel. In the politest manner possible he asked the lady in charge whether he could have some luncheon. She said, "Unfortunately, we have not anything in." He happened to see through an open door some people having a meal, and he said, "Cannot you give me a little of what these are having?" And the reply was, "We have only enough for ourselves." Thereupon he said, "You call this an hotel! Surely you can supply me with some sort of food, however light it may be!" Then the landlord came upon the scene, and said, "We are not in the habit of being spoken to like that. I am quite able to do without custom such as yours." That was his morning's experience within a few miles of the great University centre of Oxford. If he were in the position of the right hon. Member for Oxford University he should feel it his duty to have a representation made in regard to such cases as that at the next brewsters sessions. What was wanted was that the public rights should be protected in connection with this Bill, and that travellers, in a reasonable way, should be able to get food as well as intoxicating liquors in every inn in the land. Everybody recognised that intoxicating liquors taken without food had a much greater effect than they had if taken with food, and, therefore, in all seriousness, he contended that the whole influence of the House should be directed to see that to a greater extent than at present food should be taken with intoxicating liquors; but that did not weaken the strength of his contention, that what was needed in connection with any reform of the licensing laws was that the authority of the licensing justices in regard to this most important matter should be strengthened by this Bill and not weakened. Therefore he supported the Amendment.

COLONEL PILKINGTON (Lancashire, Newton) said that the powers of the licensing justices in various parts of the country were regulated by a number of practically unprinted by-laws on which they acted. The local magistrates had all a slightly different procedure. He did not know whether, under this Bill, power might be given to the local authorities to make by-laws in regard to procedure in such cases, which by-laws should be confirmed by the Home Office or the quarter sessions. That would be a great advantage as a large number of the Amendments on the Paper could be regulated by these by-laws, which would show where the power of the local magistrates should stop and where the higher powers began.

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 180; Noes, 265. Division List No. 181.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dobbie, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Capt. E.C (SAndrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Fran. H.(Maidstone)
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles

Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone, Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt.Hn. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hain, Edward
Harcourt, Lewis V.(Rossendale
Harcourt,RtHn.SirW(Monm'th
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, VincentP.(Cavan,W.
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (Accrington)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.

M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh,N.)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt.Hn.John (Montrose
Murphy, John
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow,W.)
O'Doherty, William
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon,N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Reid, Sir R. Threshie(Dumfries
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Seely, Maj. J.E.B.(Isle of Wight)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, H.C(North'mb.Tyneside

Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A.(Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, JohnCathcart(Orkney)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J.(York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh. N.)
Woodhouse,Sir J.T(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Broadhurst and Mr. Mansfield.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Aird, Sir John
Allhusen, AugustusHenryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster,Rt.Hn.Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt.Hon. A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Mich. Hicks
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bignold, Arthur
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Lt.-Col.H.F(Middlesex
Bowles,T.Gibson (King's Lynn)
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt.Hn.J.A.(Glasgow
Campbell, J.H.M.(DublinUniv.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt.Hon. J.(Birm.
Chamberlain,Rt Hn.J.A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig,Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.)
Crean, Eugene
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson. Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dorington, Rt.Hn. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt.Hn. Sir WilliamHart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Farrell, James Patrick
Fergusson, Rt.Hn.SirJ(Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn)
Gordon, Maj.Evans (T'r H'lets)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green, Walford D.(Wednesbury
Greene,Sir E.W(B'rySEdm'nds
Greene, Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Greene, W.Raymond (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R.(Dulwich)
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hobhouse, RtHnH(Somers't,E
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, Jn.(Kent,Faversham)
Howard, J.(Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks., N.R.)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kennaway, Rt.Hn.Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh.
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.(Salop)
Kimber, Henry
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks., N.R.
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col.CharlesW.(Evesham)
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Fadden, Edward
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell,RtHn.Sir H.E(Wigt'n
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt.Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell William (Burnley)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert

Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan, Col.John P.(Galway,N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Dowd, John
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington
Peel, Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ritchie, Rt.Hn.Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir H. S. (Limehouse)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col.Thos. Myles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H.(Renfrew)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, James Parker(Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hon.Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas.(Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.Sir C.E.H(Sheffield
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond,Rt.Hn.Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E(Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G.E.(Notts.)
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R.(Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H.(Yorks.)
Wodehouse,Rt. Hn. E.R.(Bath
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon.C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Young, Samuel
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

MR. J. H. LEWIS (Flint Boroughs) said he wished to move to add after "ill-conducted," "or are remote from or difficult of police supervision." The question of police supervision came up before the Royal Commission; and a considerable amount of interesting evidence was given on it. He was quite content to found himself on the Reports of that Commission. The Majority Report, which was signed by eight members of the licensed trade, said that strict supervision of licensed houses should be maintained; and the Minority Report stated that it was difficult to over-rate the importance of strict supervision. Evidence was given showing that in country districts there were houses which could not be approached by a policeman without his being seen for a distance of three miles. What effective police supervision could be exercised in a case of that kind? The Chief Constable of Plymouth stated that there were public-houses in that town where the upper rooms were let to several tenants. In one house there were twenty-one persons. He added that the police could have no effective supervision over them. A clergyman from Devonport also gave evidence. They were told that the clergy were not to have any say in this Bill; but the duties of a clergyman led him into the lowest districts in the great towns; and the clergy had special opportunities of knowing the state of affairs. That witness said that families lodged in the smaller public-houses; that they were mostly drunken families; and that if they were not drunken when they came they very quickly became drunken. This class of house constituted one of the great evils with which magistrates had to deal in connection with the licensed trade, and in some parts of the country they had dealt with it very effectively. In Liverpool, for instance, the magistrates called upon the licensed victuallers to close a large number of back and side entrances, which made the houses difficult of police supervision. The licence-holders did not see their way to comply with the request, whereupon the magistrates intimated that the record of every house would be carefully examined, and the result was that at the next licensing sessions undertakings were given that the back and side entrances complained of should be closed. As a consequence, police supervision had become infinitely more effective, and he believed this course of action was one of the causes of the astounding decrease in the convictions for drunkenness in Liverpool, the number having dropped from 16,000 to 4,000 per annum. That was not merely a decrease on paper. Committees appointed by municipalities all over the kingdom had borne testimony to its reality, and responsible persons well acquainted with Liverpool declared it to be an infinitely more sober city. This power of enforcing effective police supervision would practically cease to exist under the Bill as it stood. It had been urged that the loss of licence would be too heavy a penalty for disobedience to such an order, but there was no likelihood of the magistrates acting harshly in the matter, past experience having shown that they never adopted strong measures unless an overwhelming case had been made out against a particular house. It would be absolutely impossible for a county licensing committee to inspect particular premises as the local justices had done for the purpose of ascertaining whether they could be effectively supervised, and he submitted that it was far better that the power should remain in the hands of the local justices as at present. Respectable publicans would not be injured in the least degree by this Amendment; it would affect only those who were not willing to comply with the reasonable requests of the magistrates. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 7, after the words 'ill-conducted' to insert the words 'or are remote from or difficult of police supervision.'"—(*Mr. J. H. Lewis.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. BRIGG (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley) said he could not help thinking that the Government had made a slip in leaving out of the Bill the words of this Amendment. One of the first things that a Licensing Bench asked the police when a licence was applied for was whether the house was suitably situated and constructed for effective police supervision. For thirty years he had had a good deal to do with the blocking up of backdoors and side entrances. There were only two grounds in the Bill on which licences might be refused, but he was informed there were no fewer than twenty-four different grounds on which licences had been endorsed. In all well-regulated districts the principle of the Amendment had been acted upon already, and it would be a very great deprivation of power if it were left out of the Bill. He was very strongly of opinion that the Amendment should be introduced in some form or other, and if the right hon. Gentleman was not prepared to accept it as it stood, he hoped he would be able to give a promise to deal with the matter with the other items which were now being taken out of the hands of the licensing magistrates.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's) said the hon. Member for Flint Boroughs had given very good reasons, not for the acceptance of the Amendment, but for the abolition of some of the houses which were difficult of police supervision. But though he agreed with much the hon. Member had said with reference to the evil complained of, he could not agree, on the ground either of equity or of efficiency, with the method by which he proposed to deal with it. He would have thought these houses were just those in respect of which compensation ought to be paid. They were presumably in the same place as when the licence was granted, and it was through no misconduct on the part of the licensee that their removal was now desired; therefore, if the licence was to be taken away, he thought there was a clear title to compensation. As to efficiency, the licensing justices would have a much freer hand in dealing with these houses if they knew they could award compensation. Judging from the speeches that had been made by experienced chairmen of quarter sessions, he was convinced that they would exercise their powers much more drastically if they felt that by so doing they would not be inflicting any individual hardship. He desired to see these houses reduced, and he was certain that object would be largely secured under the provisions of the Bill with regard to compensation. The hon. Member had also stated that the quarter sessions would be unable to deal with these houses so efficiently as the old brewster sessions. But with regard to ill-conducted houses, the brewster sessions would have all the power they had hitherto possessed. With regard to the action of quarter sessions, they would have to act upon the report of the local justices. At the present moment, in any of these cases in which brewster sessions acted, an appeal lay to quarter sessions. He was very sorry he could not accept this Amendment.

MR. WHITTAKER said that the Home Secretary's argument seemed to be based upon the idea that the only houses the licences of which would be refused would be those which were well managed and against which there was no complaint, and that the licence would be taken away solely because they were remote and difficult of police supervision. He could not imagine that any bench of magistrates would withhold the licences of houses on those grounds. Ill-conducted houses remote from police supervision were a most unsatisfactory class of houses, and should not be entitled to compensation on refusal of renewal of licences. The Bill, however, provided that compensation should be given in those cases. In the case of a house that had been mentioned the road could be seen for three miles, and the publican might be up to all sorts of tricks with impunity when he could have such long notice of the visits of the police. It was well known that this sort of thing was going on, but sufficient evidence could not be obtained owing to the difficulty of supervision. Now the justices could refuse the renewal of a licence on the ground that it was difficult of police supervision, but they would not refuse it if it was a house with a good reputation. Was it suggested that a magistrate would, in cold blood so to speak, refuse the licence of a well-managed house because it was some distance from police supervision? He was sure that magistrates would not refuse a licence to a house with a good character, no matter how remotely it was situated.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said that there was one very important point raised by this Amendment, and it was the effect of non-compliance with the order of the justices in certain cases. This Amendment dealt with two classes of houses, one where the house was remote from police supervision, and the other where it was difficult of police supervision. Under the Act of 1902 a very salutary provision was inserted in Section 11 which gave the justices power to call for various alterations and plans of what they thought ought to be done in reference to the structure of the house. Sub-section 4 of that section provided that in the case of any application for the renewal of a licence the licensing justices might require a plan of the premises to be produced, and order such alterations to be made as they thought reasonably necessary for the proper conduct of the business in that part of the premises where intoxicating liquors were sold. No other order could be made in regard to those particular premises for five years, fines being provided for in case of non-compliance with the order. Licensing magistrates had adopted the practice of calling for the plans of the houses where they thought structural alterations were necessary. Supposing such an order were made and it was not complied with, would disobedience to any such order constitute ill-conduct of the house? Where there was misconduct in the management of licensed premises the justices in the Court below could refuse the licence, and no compensation would be payable. He desired to know the intention of the Government in regard to this point. Would licensed premises be regarded as ill-conducted if the licence-holder declined to obey the order of the justices for structural alteration? He thought it was doubtful whether that would constitute misconduct. In such cases of wilful disobedience the licence-holder ought to be placed in this position, that when he asked for a renewal the magistrates should have the right of saying, "No; you have disobeyed our order, and therefore we will refuse to renew your licence." In a case of that kind the holder ought not to be entitled to compensation. If compensation were to be given at all, it should be in a congested area, and where there was no particular reason why the licence of a house should be taken away, except that the justices wished to reduce the number. If a house were so remote that it was not necessary at all, and served no public purpose, the licence-holder was not entitled to compensation; and the justices in the Court below should be able to refuse renewal without reference to the quarter sessions. Everything turned upon that. He hoped the Solicitor-General would state whether, in his view, this case constituted a disqualification.

MR. DISRAELI reminded the hon. Member opposite that, in the case of the tin mine he had mentioned, if the owner had paid into an insurance fund he would undoubtedly have got compensation. He strongly supported the argument of his right hon. friend the Home Secretary. This Bill would deal with the cases of remote public-houses, and those hon. Members who had had a great deal to do with county work knew that it was an exceedingly difficult thing for the county police force to supervise all these remote public-houses. These remote public-houses might be divided into two classes, badly-conducted and well-conducted. If a house was badly-conducted, it would go under by the action of the magistrates; if it was well-conducted this Bill would remove the difficulty.

MR. MCKENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) said he was sure that members of the Government would drop a tear to think that the "Sharpe *v.* Wakefield" decision would be the law no longer. If this Amendment were not accepted that decision would no longer stand. As the law now stood, the Court of quarter sessions, after hearing the evidence, could refuse to renew on the ground of the remoteness of the premises from police supervision; that remoteness was under the existing law sufficient ground for non-renewal of the licence. If this Amendment was not accepted they would depart from that decision. The objection to this Amendment put forward by the Home Secretary was that the true ground for compensation under this Bill was where a licence was taken away owing to no fault of the holder. If that was so, why did he not say so in the Bill? If the Committee understood that the intention of the Government was to compensate only the holders of licences who were deprived of their licences through no fault of their own, that would be, on the face of it, an equitable reason, assuming that the grounds adopted by the Government were accepted. If the Home Secretary would act upon the statements made by himself, the Prime Minister, and the Solicitor-General, and formulate them in clear and intelligible words, he would get through with this measure very much more quickly. It was because the Committee had to protect the public rights against the brewers' claims that hon. Members were compelled to introduce Amendment after Amendment in order that the justices or other authorities should not be unduly limited in the exercise of their discretion.

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL (Sir EDWARD CARSON, Dublin University), said he was greatly afraid that if they adopted the suggestion of the hon. Member who had just sat down, they would bring upon themselves a great many more Amendments than they had at the present moment. He did not for a moment suppose that the trade would object to a sweeping clause of that kind — that compensation was to be paid in every case where a licence was withdrawn through no fault of the holder. That would be a very easy method of legislation, but it would take up too much time to state the numerous objections which would be raised to any such sweeping words as those suggested. His right hon. and learned friend opposite had put to him a Question as to what would happen if the magistrates made a certain order for the improvement of premises and the order was disobeyed. He did not think that question really arose on the question of misconduct at all. What it did arise upon was the question of structural deficiency of the premises. These words had been left as wide as possible. The words were "structurally deficient or unsuitable," and what really would happen would be this. He would like the Committee to see how well the law gave power to the magistrates in these cases, and that none of the matters would happen which the mover of the Amendment seemed to anticipate from the passing of the Bill. What were the powers of the magistrates in relation to this matter—in the first place, as the hon. Member had pointed out, they had power under the Act of 1892 to impose a penalty of twenty shillings a day for every day the alteration remained unexecuted after a specified time. He thought that very few of the men they were dealing with would last long if they went on incurring a penalty of twenty shillings a day. It would put an end to the question of compensation, and it would put an end to the public-house in a very summary way. Although this matter was dealt with in a subsequent part of the Bill, still it was germane to the question now before the Committee. If premises were structurally deficient or unsuitable after the magistrates had made an order for alterations, the magistrates, when the man came before them, would be able to say, "You have not obeyed our order. Your premises are structurally deficient, or structurally unsuitable. We have given you a chance, and we will now take away your licence on that ground." If they took it away there was an appeal but no compensation would be paid in such cases. The mover of the Amendment said the local magistrates were much better judges of the question of the structural alterations that might be necessary than quarter sessions. But the position would be exactly the same after the Bill was passed as it was now.

In regard to the other matter raised by the Amendment, were they going, because premises were "remote from or difficult of police supervision," to deprive the licence-holder of compensation? Supposing a man got a licence at a time, say, when there was a police barrack near it, and that it was thought more convenient to have the barrack elsewhere, or that it was decided that the police force should be less than it was before, and if the licence-holder had done nothing to bring himself within the provisions of the Bill which would deprive him of compensation, surely it was not unfair to say that if he subscribed to the insurance fund he ought to get compensation. Might he say to the hon. Member that this very Amendment seemed to him to be an illustration of how necessary it was to have some such scheme as this. The hon. Member had described to the Committee numbers of these houses which he said it was practically impossible to supervise from their situation or otherwise, and, if that was so, how did it come that with absolute discretion vested in the magistrates these houses had continued to exist? Simply and solely because the magistrates had not felt that they should take away these licences when there was no fault on the part of the licensees. If the house was very remote and not a public convenience the compensation would be very small. He submitted, therefore, that this was not a reasonable Amendment.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 176; Noes, 258. (Division List, No. 182.)

AYES

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Delany, William
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Capt E.C (SAndrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans, Sir Fran. H. (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford

Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hn. Sir E. (Berwick
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Hain, Edward
Harcourt, Lewis V.(Rossendale
Harcourt,RtHn.Sir W(Monm't
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones,DavidBrynmor(Swansea)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy,Vincent P.(Cavan,W.
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (Accrington)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt.Hn. John (Montrose
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow,W.
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Reid, Sir R. Threshie(Dumfries
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, HerbertL. (Cleveland
Schwann, Charles E.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Seely,Maj.J.E.B. (Isle of Wight
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas,David Alfred (Merthyr
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Wallace, Robert
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
White, Luke, (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.
Wilson, Henry, J. (York, W.R.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—
Mr. Herbert Lewis and
Mr. Trevelyan.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allhusen, Augustus H. Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster,Rt.Hn.HughO.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour,Rt. Hon. A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour,Rt.HnGeraldW.(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T.(Windsor)
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Beach,Rt.Hn.SirMichael Hicks
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles,Lt.-Col.H.F.(Middlesex
Bowles, T.Gibson (King's Lynn
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Butcher, John George
Campbell,Rt.Hn.J.A.(Glasgow
Campbell,J.H.M.(Dublin Univ.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J.(Birm.
Chamberlain,Rt.Hn.J.A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Rt. Hn. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig,Charles Curtis (Antrim,S.
Crean, Eugene
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale, Rt.Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland,SirFred Dixon
Dorington, Rt.Hn. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt.Hn.Sir William Hart
Fergusson,Rt.Hn.Sir J.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald,Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon.Edward Algernon
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, PhilipS.(Warwick,S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon,Hn.J.E.(Elgin & Nairn
Gordon,MajEvans (T'rH'mlets

Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury
Greene, Sir EW(B'rySEdm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hardy, Laurence(Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R. (Dulwich
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heath, James (Staffords. N. W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hobhouse, RtHnH(Somers't, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, John(K'nt, Faversham
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks. N.R.
Lee, ArthurH. (Hants. Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliot (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt, Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, RtHn. Sir H. E(Wigt'n
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell, William (Burnley)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moore, William
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, RtHn. A. Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Doherty, William
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, James(Roscommon, N.
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir HarryS. (Limehouse
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H. (Renfrew
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox Thomas
Spear, Jahn Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles.
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col SirC. E. H(Sheffield
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir WilliamH.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hn. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Young, Samuel
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.) said that the Amendment standing in his name raised a point of considerable importance. It was—

> "In page 1, line 7, leave out 'or are,' and insert 'or that undesirable practices or methods of trading having been carried on in or in connection therewith or that the premises are insanitary or.'"

The effect of Clause 1 as it now stood was to reduce the discretion of the local licensing justices to the level of their discretion in regard to the ante-1869 beer licences. The best way for him to explain the reasons for moving this Amendment was to mention three or four "undesirable practices" as to which there could be no doubt, and to ask the Solicitor-General whether the phrase in the Bill "ill-conducted" would cover these practices and give the licensing justices the power to refuse a licence without compensation. First of all, there was defective management as distinguished from ill-conduct. Then there was the irregular opening of licensed premises. It might be easily argued that these points were not covered by the phrase "ill-conducted." Next, there was offering attractions to induce customers to patronise a public-house, such as giving the "long pull," giving free drinks at Christmas, etc. These were the kind of "undesirable practices" which the licensing justices had, during the last few years, considered grounds on which they were permitted to refuse licences. The Royal Commission had brought before them a great deal of evidence as to the existence of these undesirable practices, especially in regard to music and dancing, which necessarily led to undesirable consequences, and the "long pull," which was still resorted to to a very large extent all over the country. It was of the utmost consequence that every effort should be made to widen, as far as possible, the discretion of the licensing justices, and the object of his Amendment was to secure that.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 7, to leave out the word 'are,' and insert the words 'that undesirable practices or methods of trading have been carried on in or in connection therewith or that the premises are insanitary or.'"—(*Mr. Herbert Roberts.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'are' stand part of the clause."

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR said that in the absence of any satisfactory explanation from his right hon. friend the Solicitor-General, he should feel obliged to support the Amendment. The real position was that they were attempting to define the grounds on which magistrates could refuse licences without compensation. At present the magistrates had absolute discretion, always provided it was judicially exercised. It was now proposed to limit the grounds on which they could refuse a licence without compensation. The first ground was that the licensed premises was ill-conducted; but there were other practices which, although not statutory offences, did not make for the good conduct of a public-house. In Liverpool and other large centres the licensing magistrates, with the assistance of the trade—and the trade was perfectly willing to co-operate—had been able to bring about certain reforms. There was the case of the "long pull." He had no practical experience of it himself; but he believed it meant giving extra measure in order to unduly stimulate the drinking propensity, especially in the case of women. The magistrates were able to put a stop to that practice. The sale of drink to children was now a statutory offence; but before it was, the magistrates in certain centres exercised pressure and put a stop to it. He wanted to know from the Solicitor-General whether the magistrates would, in future, be in a weaker or in a similar position as the result of this clause. The declared intention of the Government was to compensate those who lost their licences through no fault of their own; but they ought to know if, in carrying out that object, the disciplinary power of the magistrates over the trade would be weakened. He hoped that a satisfactory explanation would be given, as many Unionists, in the House and out of it, felt very strongly on the matter.

MR. WHITLEY said that the real question was that the power which the magistrates at present exercised for the better conduct of public-houses would be taken away from them. Let the Committee consider such practices as giving sweets to children, or giving away free drinks. At present the magistrates could say that unless such practices were stopped they would consider very carefully the renewal of the licence. That power was now to be taken away; and the licence-holder could snap his fingers at the magistrates. He was sorry that no explanation was given as to why the clause was not drafted the other way round. Many Unionist Members had informed him that, in their opinion, the first clause should provide that where a licence was not renewed on the ground that there were too many licences in the neighbourhood compensation should be given. He could not understand why the Government made no response to that suggestion. He had heard that the Bill was originally drafted in that way, but that it was altered. It was due to the Committee that a clear reason for the change should be given. The argument of the Home Secretary when he introduced the Bill was that it would be unfair to pick out a particular house and suppress it without compensation, although it might be no worse than the other houses in the locality. That, as far as it went, was a sound argument if they went in for compensation at all; but the Government ought to consider whether the clause should not be restored to its original form.

Sir JOHN GORST (Cambridge University) said that they were told by the Government that there was no intention of interfering with the discretionary power of the magistrates. The only objection he saw to the Amendment was that it was unnecessary, as its purport was included in the phraseology of the Bill. But, on that point, the Committee ought to have the assurance of the Solicitor-General. He himself thought that the word "ill-conduct" embraced all the practices which had been described. If the Solicitor-General would assure the Committee that that was so, then, he thought, the hon. Gentleman might withdraw his Amendment. He was speaking on the assumption that the Government did not mean by the phraseology of the Bill to limit, in any way, the discretionary power now possessed by the magistrates.

Sir ROBERT REID said he agreed with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University. The matter was of extreme importance. The object of the Amendment was to enable the magistrates to exercise pressure. There were only two ways of putting on pressure. One was by the infliction of penalties, which they were precluded from proposing because it would be outside the scope of the Bill; and the other was the method which at present existed, namely, the right of the magistrates to refuse a licence. They had two categories, one the refusal of a licence with compensation, the other the refusal of a licence for an offence without compensation. The second category disinclined justices to act, on the ground that it would be harsh treatment to deprive a man of his licence without compensation. Accordingly, there was no remedy left in connection with the practices which they wished to discontinue except the extreme remedy of forfeiting the licence. That was the position. The Amendment did not propose anything unfair or arbitrary. The existing powers with regard to discontinuance of licences were to be divided between quarter sessions and the licensing justices. But if there was no intention of interfering with the disciplinary jurisdiction of the local magistrates, why should not this matter be left with the licensing justices with an appeal to quarter sessions? The powers of pressure with respect not of statutory offences, but of such matters as child service, would be entirely taken away from the magistrates by the peculiar construction of the Bill. With regard to the particular Amendment before the Committee, "undesirable practices" might cover matters which would not strictly come within the term "ill-conducted." As to "undesirable methods of trading," if some such words were not inserted the magistrates would certainly lose their power of insisting upon proper conditions with regard to the tenure of the house, the tying of a house, or matters of that kind. Whatever else was done, the Committee ought to reserve to the magistrates the power of pressure which they at present possessed. subject to appeal to quarter sessions.

Sir EDWARD CARSON submitted that the way in which the Bill had been drafted would effectively prevent magistrates unjustifiably placing public-houses in the class to which compensation would be paid. The Bill stated in black and white certain grounds in regard to which if a licence was refused no compensation would be forthcoming, therefore the magistrates would have to place those cases in the class to which compensation would not be paid.

Sir ROBERT REID: The Bill does not say that the magistrates "must"; they can do as they like, and that makes all the difference.

Sir EDWARD CARSON: Not at all.

Sir ROBERT REID: Surely the Solicitor-General does not maintain that wherever there is ill-conduct, structural deficiency, or question concerning the character or fitness of the proposed licence-holder, the magistrates are bound to take away the licence ?

SIR EDWARD CARSON said that what he meant was that if the magistrates came to the conclusion that a licence ought to be taken away on any of the three specified grounds, the Bill was so framed as to amount to a direction to the magistrates to give no compensation. It left no loophole for magistrates to take the course feared by the hon. and learned Member. He agreed that the disciplinary powers of the magistrates ought not to be taken away, and he denied that they were being taken away by the Bill. There could hardly be a wider term than "ill-conduct," and it was for the magistrates to decide what came within the term. Whether "lax management" was of a sufficiently serious kind to be called "ill-conducted" and the other matters referred to by the hon. and learned Member, would all be left to the magistrates to determine. At present if a complaint of lax management was made, the magistrates would probably warn the licence-holder that unless matters improved they would take serious notice of the complaint at the next licensing sessions, and there was nothing whatever in the Bill to prevent a similar course being followed in the future. Whether the offering of attraction—the provision of music, and so forth—came within the term "ill-conduct" would all be for the magistrates to determine.

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR: Are we to understand that there would be no appeal from the magistrates' construction of "ill-conduct" ?

SIR EDWARD CARSON: There would be an appeal to quarter sessions.

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR: And beyond that ?

SIR EDWARD CARSON: Certainly not.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS: Except by special case, I suppose ?

SIR EDWARD CARSON: There might be that, no doubt.

SIR ROBERT REID: They would not be bound to give their reasons.

SIR EDWARD CARSON: Nor would they for misconduct. They would say "We refuse the licence on the ground that the premises have been ill-conducted, and they would not be bound to give any reasons. As a matter of fact, the disciplinary power of pressure would be much greater than at present because if a licence-holder failed to come up to the view of the magistrates he would run the risk of losing the whole of the compensation to which he had contributed. Therefore, the power, instead of being weakened, would be greatly strengthened.

*MR. LAWSON WALTON (Leeds, S.) said he wished to know if the words in the clause "ill-conducted" meant that the premises had been ill-conducted in the opinion of the magistrates. This ought to be made clear by a definition clause. As the section was drawn, "ill-conducted" was purely in relation to the premises, and had no bearing whatever in regard to the trade. The Solicitor-General knew very well the class of offence he had in his mind—where the licensed premises had been used as a resort for betting men or harbouring persons of ill-fame, and instead of being used for refreshment by the public had, by the permission of the owner, been "ill-conducted" in ways which conflicted with good order and due observance of the law. He was sure that the Solicitor-General would not say it was an extravagant suggestion. Obviously certain methods of trading, which all regarded as objectionable, would have nothing to do with "ill-conduct," as, for instance, the "long pull," which was an objectionable method of trading. It might also include the employment of certain persons in the service of a licensed person, not only children, but also the employment of barmaids. In Glasgow they regarded the employment of barmaids as highly objectionable. Proper regulation of the staff, the prohibition of objectionable methods of trading by offering inducements to drinking, and unfair competition—none of these fell within the meaning of the expression "ill-conducted," confined as it was to the premises. Therefore, he wished to challenge the earnestness of the Solicitor-General by asking him to see that this very serious doubt was removed by placing in a definition clause the exposition of this section which he had just given. If the right hon. Gentleman would boil down into a phrase the speech he had just delivered the point of the Amendment would be met.

MR. CORBETT (Glasgow, Tradeston) said he felt quite sure that the Committee would accept the interpretation given by the Solicitor-General upon this point, and he hoped it would be carried out. The hon. Member for Liverpool had alluded to what had been done in that city in carrying out the regulations made by the magistrates, which had greatly improved the conduct of the trade there and had reduced drunkenness by one-third. At Liverpool the disciplinary powers of the magistrates over the ordinary public-houses were complete, and they had brought about a great improvement. But in regard to the ante-1869 beerhouses, the Liverpool magistrates complained that they could do nothing, because they had not the same wide discretion over these particular houses as they had over the conduct of other houses. He hoped that the Government would place words in Clause 1 which would give justices a discretionary power of determining what was "ill conduct," as mentioned in the clause. The proposal to do away with barmaids had been mentioned by the hon. Member for South Leeds. It was treated sometimes with a certain kind of scorn in quarters with no experience of the system of employing barmaids. The system had been done away with in many countries, and he ventured to think that if the time came in England when this occupation was done away with, as it had been in Glasgow, people would look back with wonder upon the time when such occupation was carried on by young women. Barmaids were in many instances kept at work from ninety to ninety-five hours per week, and a more dangerous and more injurious occupation it would be very difficult to imagine. It was a very great thing that the magistrates, in the exercise of their discretion in Glasgow, had been able to make a valuable experiment in this direction, and he hoped ultimately it would be followed in other parts of the country.

*MR. LAWRENCE (Liverpool, Abercromby) said that the disciplinary powers of the magistrates should be preserved was quite plain. He thought the clause as it stood seemed at first sight to be open to the criticisms passed upon it by the hon. and learned Member opposite. By the insertion of the word "conduct" later on, he thought the discretionary power of the magistrates would remain intact.

SIR EDWARD GREY said the Solicitor-General had endeavoured to soothe, and to some extent had soothed, the apprehension entertained with regard to the effect of this clause by giving a very wide interpretation to the words "ill-conducted." He wished to ask the Home Secretary if he would do something to make it quite clear what the Committee intended by inserting, somewhere, the words "in the opinion of the justices." If those words were inserted, they would at any rate strengthen the interpretation suggested by the Solicitor-General.

MAJOR JAMESON trusted that the Home Secretary would in no way alter this clause. The Committee ought not to forget that all these legal subtleties were not of the slightest use to the common or garden magistrate, and he was one of them. There was not a single crime in the calendar which this clause did not cover. If they kept adding these legal subtleties, it would take three sessions to get the Bill through. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would insist upon the clause standing intact.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH (Anglesey) said the difficulty felt on both sides of the House was one apparently which the Government was anxious to meet, and he thought words could be inserted which would meet their views. The difficulty arose from the fear that "ill-conducted" was too strong a term. He suggested that if the Home Secretary would introduce some word or words which would make the expression "ill-conducted" less rigid, such as "lax management" or "badly conducted," it would meet the wishes of Members on that side of the Committee.

SIR JOHN KENNAWAY (Devonshire, Honiton) said he had listened with very great satisfaction to the statement of the Solicitor-General; and, as both sides were in practical agreement on this matter, he thought they might ask the Home Secretary to undertake that words should be inserted which would carry out the assurance of the Solicitor-General.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he trusted the Home Secretary would respond to the appeal which had come not only from the Opposition side of the House but also from his own side, to do something to meet the case which had been placed before the Committee. He was afraid the words suggested by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Berwick, "in the opinion of the magistrates," did not make any substantial alteration in the meaning of the clause. The words "ill-conducted" were too strong to cover the various difficulties suggested by his hon. friend. Take such a case as had recently arisen in Liverpool of sailors' advance notes. That was a case in which it would not be "ill-conduct" or an offence against the law, but at the same time it was a practice that ought to be put an end to, and the magistrates ought to have the requisite power to do so. "Free drinks" was another case. The hon. member for Halifax had mentioned a case of serious assault outside a public-house which very nearly led to murder, That case was the result of a big fête which a publican had given, when there were free drinks to everybody. That, again, was a practice the magistrates should have power to put an end to. Surely the Home Secretary could give an undertaking to introduce words covering cases of this character, so that the magistrates would know the class of case they had to deal with without compensation.

*__MR. BOUSFIELD__ (Hackney, N.) said he wished, speaking as a magistrate, to say how much he appreciated the friendly language used with reference to the preservation of the disciplinary powers of the magistrates. He felt certain that it was a matter of the highest importance, and on the question of substance there was no difference between the two sides of the House. That the Government regarded this matter as one of the highest importance was shown by the fact that they had given what they considered a full catalogue. The question was whether that catalogue was wide enough to include all the cases which might arise. The Solicitor-General had expressed the opinion that the words "ill-conducted" would cover those cases contemplated by the present Amendment and a great many other things of the same sort. If the right hon. Gentleman were on the Bench he would give effect to that opinion, but his opinion now given would not be even quotable when a case came before the Court. It could in no way bind anybody, and therefore one must rely on one's own judgment as to the way this would be construed by the Judges before whom cases might come. He suggested for the consideration of the Solicitor-General the words "or any reasonable requirement of the magistrates is not complied with" as making it quite clear that the disciplinary powers of the magistrates were preserved.

MR. ATHERLEY-JONES (Durham, N.W.) said he was disposed to agree with the Solicitor-General that the words were at present sufficiently large to meet all the cases, but at the same time he was disposed, for the sake of greater security, to press upon him that it would be desirable to accept the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Berwick and add the words "in the opinion of the magistrates," which, he thought, would meet the whole case. As the clause at present stood, what would come before the Court would be misconduct, and what would come before the High Court of Justice was what was misconduct, and the interpretation there might differ widely from that of the magistrates. If, however, they put in the words "in the opinion of the magistrates," the High Court would be bound to say: "This is misconduct in the opinion of the magistrates"; and they would not be able to go behind that. He considered there could be no possible objection to the acceptance of these words.

SIR J. FERGUSSON (Manchester, N.E.) said it was proposed to introduce into the Bill a definition of the ordinary powers of the magistrates. The object of the Bill was to enable the number of public-houses to be reduced in the public interest, and to give compensation when that was done for reasons other than the misconduct of the licensee. He was anxious that the discretion of the magistrates in regard to discipline and the conditions of licences should not be impaired, but he considered it undesirable that Parliament should introduce catalogues which could not be complete, and which might open the door to many dangers.

Mr. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.) agreed with the right hon. Gentleman who had just spoken that it was dangerous to make definitions, conditions, and qualifications in the way proposed, but thought that was a criticism which he ought to apply to the authors of the Bill. The whole scheme of this first clause was to take the present unfettered discretion of the justices and reduce it to a mere shadow of its former self. He understood the object of the mover of the Amendment to be to reinstate, as far as was possible consistently with the object of the Bill, the justices in their discretion. He was inclined to share the opinion that under the term "ill-conducted" the practices referred to in the course of the debate might very likely be held not to be included. It was not safe, if the House really wanted matters of this kind to be taken into account by the justices, to let the Bill pass with this vague phrase. Matters of this kind ought to be dealt with in a rational and sensible way, and a course which would save a great deal of time would be if the Government consented to introduce words which would elucidate the interpretation of "ill-conducted." He would suggest that the clause should run "ill-conducted, or that the licensee has failed to comply with any reasonable requirement made by the justices." He thought that that would cover all cases of misconduct, and would enable the licensing justices to retain a large share of the beneficent power which they now possessed of controlling licences.

Mr. MIDDLEMORE (Birmingham, N.) said hon. Members on both sides of the House had listened with interest and sympathy to the explanation of the Solicitor-General; but the request now was that he should make clear what was not so clear. This was all they asked. It was evident to him, but there were legal luminaries in the House to whom it was certainly not clear and to whom it appeared susceptible of a construction other than that which the right hon. and learned Gentleman placed upon it. They asked him very respectfully and earnestly to introduce into the Bill phrases and alterations which would satisfy those who were pleased with his interpretation of the word "ill-conducted" but were not satisfied with the form in which it was expressed.

Mr. WHITTAKER said he did not like the phrase "ill-conducted." It seemed to him that better words would be "that the licensed premises and the trade thereof have been unsatisfactorily conducted."

Mr. EDWARDS (Radnor) said that there seemed to be a general feeling on both sides of the House that something should be done in the direction of the Amendment. The hon. and gallant Member for West Clare said that the Amendment should not be accepted because the magistrates would not be bothered with legal subtleties. Why, that was the very reason why the Committee should accept the words suggested in the Amendment. It was very necessary that such practices as were referred to in the Amendment should be stopped. In the Act of 1872, six or seven reasons were given for closing a public-house on account of malpractices, and since that time there had been an immensely increased competition in the business of licensed houses, and that competition led licensed holders to do things which ought not to be done in the way of enticing trade. It was to contend with that new state of things that the Amendment had been proposed.

Mr. SAMUEL EVANS urged that the best course would be for the Government to state in what cases compensation should be given. It was the duty of all hon. Members to offer assistance in carrying out the views expressed on both sides of the House, and he suggested the addition after "ill-conducted" of the words "or that any other requirement or condition which the justices may in their discretion make or impose has not been complied with or observed." He thought these words would carry out the wishes expressed on both sides of the House.

COLONEL PILKINGTON said he thought that the Bill would go through much more quickly if words were inserted preserving the power of the local justices, except in cases where a public-house was abolished because it was not required.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield) said the House was in an extraordinary position. The Solicitor-General said the word "ill-conducted" was subject to one interpretation, whilst legal Gentlemen of the greatest ability on his own and the other side of the House thought it was capable of a different interpretation. Why did the Government treat the House with silence when there was absolute agreement on this point on both sides of the House? He did not know whether the Solicitor-General or the Home Secretary was in charge of the Bill because they went in and out of the House continually and did not hear the arguments. The Solicitor-General had been out of the House twice.

SIR EDWARD CARSON said that he had only been out of the House once, and that it was absolutely impossible for one who had other duties to discharge to remain the whole time in the House.

MR. MARKHAM, who rose again amid loud cries of "withdraw," said he would certainly withdraw if the Solicitor-General said he had only been out once. Proceeding, he said that the discussion had been confined very largely to legal Gentlemen. Some took one view and others another view as to the interpretation of the word "ill-conducted," and he thought a very simple arrangement, seeing that hon. Members on both sides of the House were in agreement, would be for the Government to accept some words to save all this discussion. The suggestion of the hon. Member for Berwick to insert the words "in the opinion of the magistrates" met entirely the view of hon. Members on that side of the House. If it were made clear that it was to be "ill-conducted" in the opinion of the magistrates, what clearer definition could they have. As legal gentlemen differed, some of whom might be Judges in time to come, why in the name of creation did the Government, if it wanted to facilitate the passing of the Bill, maintain an absolute silence in regard to the suggestions made.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe) said in order to meet the point he thought they were entitled to have the opinion of the Government upon it. They had had a most business-like discussion and there was almost a common agreement that some words should be introduced such as those suggested by the right hon. Baronet the Member for Devonshire, which would be agreeable in all quarters. They were drifting into the position in which the House found itself on the previous night and no time was being gained. He hoped the Solicitor-General would be able to give to the House some actual words which would carry out the evident sense of the House on the matter.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he had really nothing to add to the statement of the Solicitor-General. Surely the case was quite plain. The Government were of opinion that a mans' licence might be taken away without compensation for misconduct; they were not of opinion that it ought to be taken away without compensation for something which was not misconduct. The word "misconduct" was a wide word. [Several MEMBERS: It is not the word used.] "Ill-conduct" was a wide word. It would have to be interpreted by the magistrates, with, of course, an appeal to quarter sessions; and he did not think the wording of the Bill in this particular could be improved. What some Members were tacitly driving at was that a man should be liable to be deprived of his licence for something which was not ill-conduct. [OPPOSITION cries of "No, no!"] Others, no doubt, would like to see the Government embark in an endless attempt to define. That might suit other objects which they had in view, but it certainly would not improve this Bill as a measure of licensing reform or help the magistrates to carry out their duty. If they did mean to increase the number of offences under the Licensing Acts it should be done by a separate Bill. He would now suggest that a decision should be taken on the matter.

Mr. ASQUITH said the right hon. Gentleman had spoken with great lucidity, and they now clearly understood that the Government offered a blank negative to all the suggestions offered, as much from their own side of the House as from the other, to meet a difficulty which, except the Prime Minister himself, no one had denied was a real one. Now the Prime Minister came in at the end of the debate and said that although the Bill contained a phrase which in all probability would not be held to cover certain practices, and although there was a general agreement that they were practices which ought to be covered, yet on behalf of the Government he refused to insert words to meet the wishes of the Committee. He would leave the situation there.

*Mr. BOUSFIELD said he did not think the Prime Minister quite appreciated the suggestions which had been made during the debate. He was quite sure that the Government did not intend to speak with two voices on the subject. The Solicitor-General had spoken quite sympathetically on behalf of the Government with reference to preserving the disciplinary powers which the magistrates at present had. The Prime Minister had put it to the Committee that the Amendment would mean very heavy penalties for slight offences. That was not the situation. At present the magistrates had power to impose reasonable requirements upon an applicant for renewal. They desired that that power should be preserved, and they understood from the Solicitor-General that the Government regarded that as a desirable object. He himself had suggested a form of words which would make it clear; and he ventured humbly to suggest that the Prime Minister had not quite appreciated the situation when he spoke. He did not desire to press the Government at that moment, but the matter was one which ought to have their serious attention. The last words of the Prime Minister might, he thought, lead to some misunderstanding as being apparently out of concord with what the Solicitor-General had previously said. They did not desire to penalise the licence-holder, but only to ensure that the magistrates would have power to impose reasonable requirements.

Sir JAMES JOICEY (Durham, Chester-le-Street) said he thought it was very unfortunate that the Prime Minister should have intervened without having heard the discussion. The Committee had practically agreed that words should be inserted to preserve the discretion of the magistrates, and he hoped that arrangement would not be upset.

Mr. MARKHAM said as the Prime Minister had only just come into the House and had not heard the discussion, he thought it would be well if they went through it again.

*The CHAIRMAN: Order, order! The hon. Gentleman will not be entitled to repeat arguments.

Mr. MARKHAM said that he would not repeat arguments; but would refer to the obstruction of the Government which would prevent the Bill getting through the House. The Government would not take the view that any business man would take as to the meaning of the words under discussion. They were told, without going into the question of the employment of barmaids, which was debated at considerable length, that very considerable evils arose in many districts as the result of betting. Great evils resulted from betting, and he, therefore, should be prepared to vote for the Amendment.

Mr. J. F. HOPE (Sheffield, Brightside) said he thought the best course would be to let the words in the clause stand, and, if on further consideration it became apparent that the object sought for was not covered by them, the matter could be brought up again on the definition clause and words adopted which would satisfy the general sense of the House. It seemed to him a matter of some importance; but unless the Government could find words at once to satisfy the general sense of the Committee, it would be better, for the present, to stick to the words in the Bill.

SIR JOHN KENNAWAY said he hoped that the Government would introduce words which would give effect to the Solicitor-General's interpretation of the clause.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 268; Noes, 190. (Division List No. 183.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, AugustusHnryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster,Rt.Hn.HughO
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt.JoscelineFitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour,Rt. Hn.A.J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey
Balfour.RtHnGeraldW(Leeds
Balfour, KennethR.(Christch.
Banbury, SirFrederickGeorge
Barry, SirFrancis T.(Windsor
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Beach,Rt.HnSirMichaelHicks
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles,Lt. ColH.F(Middlesex
Bowles, T. Gibson(King's Lynn
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hn. St. John
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell,Rt.Hn.J.A.(Glasgow
Campbell, J.H.M.(Dublin Univ
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich
Chamberlain, Rt Hn.J.(Birm.
Chamberlain,Rt.Hn.J.A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Rt. Hon.Sir JohnC.R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig,Charles Curtis (Antrim,S.
Crean, Eugene
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb.Shepherd(Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale, Rt.Hn.SirJosephC.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland,SirFred Dixon
Doogan, P. C.
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn.Sir William Hart
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fergusson, Rt.Hn.SirJ.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald,SirRobert Penrose-
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster,PhilipS.(Warwick SW.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon,Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn
Gordon,MajEvans-(T'rH'mlets
Goschen, Hn. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green,WalfordD(Wednesbury
Greene,SirE W (B'rySEdm'nds
Greene,HenryD.(Shrewsbury
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hardy,Laurence(Kent Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton(Tynem'th
Harris,Dr. Fredk.R. (Dulwich
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heath, James (Staffords. N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A.(Stafford,W.)
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J. F.(SheffieldBrightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard,John(KentFave'sham
Hozier,Hn.James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kenyon-Slanley,Col.W.(Salop
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson,JohnGrant(Yorks,NR
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliot (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower,FrederickN.S
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A.R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.CharlesW (Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(BristolS.
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas,ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring,Hn.W.F.
Maxwell,RtHnSirHE(Wigton
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milner,Rt.Hn.SirFrederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moore, William
Morgan,DavidJ.(Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Alymer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray,RtHnA.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan,Col.JohnP.(Galway,N.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)

O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary N.)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Peel, Hn. Wm Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clements Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir Harry S (Limehouse
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, H C (North'mb Tyneside
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Young, Samuel
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herb. Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Delany, William
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Rt Hn Sir W (Monm'th
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hobhouse, Rt Hn H. (Somers't, E
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordon, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W.
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt. Hon John (Montrose
Moss, Samuel
Murphy, John
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry

Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Doherty, William
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spear, John Ward
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. W (Worcestersh. N,)
Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Herbert Roberts and Mr. Emmott.

Mr. HEYWOOD JOHNSTONE (Sussex, Horsham), who had on the Paper an Amendment to leave out "or are structurally deficient or unsuitable," and to insert "or that the applicant has failed to comply with an order for structural alterations under Section 11, Sub-section 4, of The Licensing Act, 1902," said that as, in consequence of the decision just taken, he was unable to move the whole of his Amendment, he proposed merely to move to omit the words "structurally deficient or." Under the Licensing Act of 1902, when application was made for the renewal of a licence, the petty sessional Court might require the submission of plans, and direct certain structural alterations to be made, from which order there was an appeal to quarter sessions. That being the case, he submitted that the necessity for including structural defects as a ground for the refusal of a licence without compensation had practically disappeared. Although it would have been more satisfactory to have made the matter perfectly clear by the insertion of the words he originally proposed to move, he thought it would be sufficient, in view of existing legislation under which an order for structural alterations could be made, to allow the matter to take the course enacted by the Act of 1902. If a licence-holder had had no opportunity given him of remedying the structural defects, the reasonable discretion of the magistrates might very well be left as at present. He did not think that structural defects *per se*, where no order had been made for alterations, should be made a ground for refusal to renew. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 7, to leave out the words 'structurally deficient or.'"—(*Mr. Heywood Johnstone.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Sir ROBERT REID pointed out that the Solicitor-General had declared the intention of the Government to be not to diminish the disciplinary jurisdiction of the magistrates. At present, the magistrates could exercise that disciplinary jurisdiction in respect of structural defects. By the present Amendment the discretion of the magistrates would incontestably be diminished; therefore he submitted that its acceptance would be wholly inconsistent with the statement of the Solicitor-General.

Sir EDWARD CARSON said he laid special stress upon these words, which he considered were absolutely necessary in order to carry out the intention of the Government.

Question put, and agreed to.

*Mr. H. D. GREENE (Shrewsbury) said he desired to move the Amendment standing in his name on the Paper. The licence-holders desired that this question should be submitted to the Government, and he hoped a fair and favourable hearing would be given to their application. It was felt that it was not clear in the clause, as it was at present worded, whether "unsuitable" was to be "structural unsuitability" or not. The word "structurally" did not appear in connection with "unsuitable." If the word "structurally" governed "unsuitable," of course that would partly meet his case. What was felt by those who held licences was that, unless this point was made quite clear, there might be an interpretation given to those words by justices which might be made a pretext for getting rid of licences without compensation. There were houses which had been in existence for a good many years, the suitability of which had never been submitted to the justices. On the other hand, there were houses the plans of which had been submitted to the justices and which had been passed by them. Then there was another class which might be called upon to rectify any deficiency in that part of the premises where the trade was carried on. The Act of 1902 only dealt with rectifying these deficiencies. When they came to structural suitability that enlarged the scope of the matter very considerably. Structural suitability applied to the whole of the structure, and it might happen that the justices, as a pretext for getting rid of a house, would say, for example, that there ought to be suitable accommodation there for sleeping and stables for cyclists and motorists, and possibly lavatories and out-houses. It might be that some of these houses had been built upon plans approved by the justices, and yet if they desired to get rid of the licence they might seize upon this pretext and say that the house was unsuitable in the particulars he had mentioned and the licence in this way might be taken away without compensation. "Unsuitable" was a relative term, and it might be that the unsuitability referred to the position of the house. The magistrates might say that public-houses ought not to be kept at the corner of streets, or that a larger house ought to be erected. On the other hand, they might say that licensed houses should only be in front streets and not in back streets. Therefore it was possible that they might have houses closed without compensation because these new views had arisen in the minds of the justices. He thought there was a good deal of force in the apprehensions felt by those who owned these licences, and to protect their interests they felt that it was necessary that the word "structurally" should be inserted before the word "unsuitable." If that word were introduced it might go part of the way towards meeting the objections of those who were afraid that they might be deprived of the benefit of their premises on the ground of "unsuitability" when the magistrates were really influenced by some other consideration. He thought, however, that when the justices themselves had prevented a house from being made structurally suitable by the tenant, it would be a very unjust course to turn round on the tenant and deprive him of his right of compensation on the very ground that the house was structurally unsuitable.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 7, to leave out the words 'unsuitable or.' "—(*Mr. H. D. Greene.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'unsuitable' stand part of the clause."

*MR. LAWSON WALTON said that under the existing law the magistrates had discretionary power to refuse the renewal of a licence because the premises were unsuitable. If they were unsuitable for the trade they ought not to be licensed, and surely it would be an attempt to fetter unduly their wide discretion in the interests of the public to say that the justices should issue licences to premises which they admitted were unsuitable. The hon. and learned Member for Shrewsbury had pointed out that the words "structural deficiency" might indicate different things. There was first the unsuitability arising from structural causes. He should have thought it was clear that if the licensed premises were ill-adapted, or if they were structurally deficient or unsuitable for the trade, the justices might in their discretion, subject to appeal to quarter sessions, refuse to renew a licence. Secondly, supposing there was a house structurally adequate but, owing to gross neglect on the part of the tenant, owing to its filthy condition and the lack of proper care, was unsuitable, surely these reasons were just as important for refusing a licence as "structural deficiency," and therefore the real question was whether the premises were suitable or not. If they were not suitable the magistrates ought to have the power to refuse the licence. It was not the kind of question that ought to be left to the administrative committee at quarter sessions to decide whether compensation should be given under these circumstances. It should be disposed of by the justices on the spot.

MR. MARKHAM said the Amendment would mean that the magistrates would have no power in the future over licensed premises which came into the market. Practically it would mean that the justices would have no power to refuse a renewal if the Amendment were passed. The Bill had, therefore, come to a very curious stage. The brewers were not content with what they had got, but came to the House of Commons and asked to have words excluded from the Bill which would enable any bad, rotten, or defective building to be used as licensed premises over which the justices would have no power whatever. If the words "structurally deficient or unsuitable" were left out all the power in the hands of the magistrates would be gone. He hoped the Government would say at once that they were not going to weaken the power of the magistrates, but leave in their hands the discretionary power they had at present of refusing licences if the premises were deficient and unsuitable for the purposes of the business. He hoped the Government would give an answer at once to this question, for by so doing they would expedite the progress of business.

SIR EDWARD CARSON said it was impossible for the Government to accept a proposal to leave out the word "unsuitable." For the purposes of police supervision, for instance, it might be necessary to order certain doors of a house to be closed. It was also often necessary, in connection with premises which were not structurally deficient for business, to order that the drinking part of the premises should be shut off from the other parts. That was structural unsuitability, and not structural deficiency, having reference to the carrying on of the business. It was necessary that they should retain in the hands of the magistrates all those rights which gave them a disciplinary power over licensed premises.

SIR ROBERT REID said he was glad that this word was going to be retained, and that was quite right from the point of view of the Government. The Solicitor-General had also put a construction upon the word "unsuitable" in this connection with which he agreed. The word "unsuitable" was governed by the word "structurally," and therefore nothing but structural unsuitability would be hit by those words. There was, however, one danger of which the hon. and learned Member for Leeds had given an illustration. Supposing the premises were kept in such a dirty, insanitary state as to make them unsuitable and undesirable for the carrying on of the trade. As the law now stood the magistrate could say, "If you do not put your premises right you shall not have your renewal." Under this Bill the magistrates could not say that unless the word "ill-conducted" had the very full significance which the Solicitor-General seemed to attribute to it. He did not think it was safe to rely on the construction which the Judges would put upon the expression "ill-conducted."

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (GENERAL POWERS) BILL (BY ORDER).

As amended, considered.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTSON (Hackney, S.) said he had three Amendments on the Paper, all of which really related to the same matter, namely, the provisions of Clause 20, which dealt with vermin-infested houses. He considered that the proposals in the Bill were far too drastic, though he did not wish to minimise in the least the inconvenience arising from the conditions indicated. There was a small insect which was known for its powers of springing and hopping, but it, he thought, was hardly within the purview of the Bill, because he could not imagine that any enactment of this House would really be of avail against that insect. There was another insect, of which he understood there was a considerable number in the county of London, and which he might term a round, flat insect. That was the insect with which this clause dealt. He pointed out that the borough councils, which were the local authorities, had already various powers with regard to nuisances which injured health. It had never been shown, and he apprehended that it could not be shown, that the existence of this class of vermin was injurious to health. [AN HON. MEMBER: Oh!] If it were injurious to health, the existing Acts would undoubtedly apply, and there would be no occasion for any further provision in the present Bill. If it were merely proposed to treat houses infested with the nuisance in the same manner as nuisances which were injurious to health were treated by Sections 4 and 5 of the London Public Health Act, 1891, he should have no objection at all. It was not so much the question of penalty which he objected to. Section 20 of this Bill enabled, or rather almost compelled, a local authority, not upon its own initiative but upon the initiative of its medical officer, to do certain repairs in the house. It might be to repaper it, or to take down plaster work. These alterations might be very expensive; and the real point of his objection to the clause was that these alterations and repairs could be done without the local authority having first to obtain an order from a magistrate. The whole duty was cast by the Bill on the medical officer. It was true that the medical officer had to satisfy the sanitary authority that the house was infested with vermin, but that seemed to him to be almost compulsory on the mere production of a certificate by the medical officer. It did not appear that any discretion was left to the local authority as to whether the work was required or not. The local authority was entitled to do any work required by the notice to be done and summarily to recover as a civil debt all reasonable costs and expenses incurred from the person making default. Under the Public Health Act of 1891, in respect of nuisances coming within the scope of Sections 4 and 5, the sanitary authority had to complain to the petty sessional court, which could issue any one of four orders. It could issue an abatement order, a prohibition order, a closing order, or a combination of such orders. It appeared to him that Section 5 of that Act applied to houses infested with vermin, and that if the court issued an order it would be an abatement order. The Act provided, "Moreover the local authority may enter the premises to which the nuisance relates, and do whatever may be necessary to execute that order." He had not the slightest objection to that. It seemed to be the right and proper method of procedure, but that was not the provision of this Bill. By Section 20 if a person failed to comply with the notice given to him then and there, the sanitary authority had a right to do the work required by the notice, and to recover all reasonable costs. That appeared to him to be placing too large a power in the hands of the local authority. Some of the repairs ordered by the local authority must take the form of what was called decoration. He used the word "decoration" in a technical sense. That was a very serious matter, because every person who had had experience in building houses knew that the decoration was more costly than the bricks and mortar. He objected to the local authority having power to do that work without first obtaining an order from a magistrate.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 15, line 13, after the word 'require' to insert the words—'(2) If a person upon whom a notice has been served as aforesaid makes default in complying with any of the requisitions thereof within the time specified, the sanitary authority shall make a complaint under the Summary Jurisdiction Acts, and the petty sessional Court hearing the complaint may make on such person a summary order requiring each person to comply with all or any of the requisitions of the notice.'"—(*Mr. Herbert Robertson.*)

Question proposed. "That those words be there inserted."

MR. HEYWOOD JOHNSTONE (Sussex, Horsham), as Chairman of the Committee which considered this Bill, said there was no question before the Committee as to the necessity of a subsection of this character. He did not feel any doubt in his own mind as to the nature of the decision the Committee came to in this case. Evidence had been given before the Committee showing that in many cases there were eight or ten layers of wall-paper on the walls of many houses, within each layer of which vermin were breeding. It was also shown that 70 per cent. of the houses in some districts were verminous, and there was no dispute as to giving the local sanitary authorities power to enter and cleanse houses of this description. The sum and substance of it was that there could not be the slightest question as to the necessity for a clause of this nature, and the only question that remained was as to the machinery that was required to carry it out. They had two models before them, the London Public Health Act of 1891, and the Public Health Act of 1875, which applied to the rest of the country. As his hon. friend had mentioned, there was n the London Act a process by getting an order from the magistrate, but the Committee were told by the medical officers that they had not been able to take action in regard to this particular nuisance under that Act. The Committee therefore proceeded on the lines of the general Public Health Act of 1875. That was the precedent which had been followed in this Bill. The Committee had evidence before them that there were cases in which the owner had taken every possible precaution to hand over houses to incoming tenants in a clean and satisfactory condition, and that in a very short time they came to be infested with a large quantity of verminous insects. It would be quite unfair to make an order against the owner to be at the expense of cleansing a house the dirtiness of which was due to the incoming tenant. On the other hand they might have a case of an innocent tenant coming into a house which was apparently clean, having a fresh paper on the wall over a series of old papers. Vermin might break out there, and there was hardly any possibility of stating, without examination, whether the owner or the occupier was responsible for that until the work was actually done. Therefore, the Committee followed the precedent of the 1875 Act, and gave the authority power to proceed against either the owner or occupier as might seem to them good. They tried to hold the balance as fairly as possible, and they thought it was better that the work should be done by the borough councils, who were accustomed to work of this character. The only point at issue was the way in which machinery should be set up for carrying out a course the desirability of which was admitted on all hands.

MR. JOHN BURNS (Battersea) said the speech of the hon. Member opposite practically rendered any further support of this clause unnecessary. He wished the House to understand that this clause was not the result of the London County Council's, action. The people who took the initiative were the London borough councils, which were the local sanitary authorities. The Committee were practically unanimous that such a measure as this was absolutely necessary in respect of verminous houses. The twenty-eight parish councils of London, the port sanitary authority, and the city Corporation were all in favour of it, and the County Council were, therefore, only the medium for carrying out the wishes of all these authorities. Under the existing Health Acts a verminous house was not a nuisance. The hon. Member for Hackney thought that the provisions in the Bill, declaring that the verminous building was a source of danger to the community, was too drastic a treatment for chasing bugs and pursuing fleas. In regard to factory inspection, if a factory inspector went into a workshop and found mouse traps or flea powder about, he could order that workshop to be whitewashed and kept sanitarily clean; and if the owner did not do it, the local authority could intervene and do the work itself, and charge the cost to the owner. If that could be done in regard to a workshop, surely it ought to be done in overcrowded tenements. In some parts of London the condition of these tenements was horrible and a source of great irritation to men, women, and children. The hon. Member for Hackney thought that the repairs in a house should not be executed without receiving an order from a magistrate; but the London magistrates, who did their work exceedingly well, ought not to be overburdened, and compelled before they made an order in regard to cleanliness to make a visit to the house. The hon. Member for Hackney said he had never seen a bug in the East End of London, but Dr. Priestly mentioned a case of a room occupied by a doctor of divinity which had not been cleaned for nine years, and another officer stated that on one occasion he went to a house in Wood Green where he caught 118 fleas. He liked the London magistrates too well to subject them to the visitation of such houses.

Mr. BOUSFIELD (Hackney, N.) said that the drastic powers proposed in the clause might properly be given to local authorities with regard to infectious diseases. But in the case of vermin, which primarily were not dangerous to health, although they might be uncomfortable, no harm would be done by a delay of a couple of days in applying for a magistrate's order. There was no opportunity provided by the clause of having a case fairly heard and fairly determined.

Mr. CROOKS (Woolwich) said that the hon. Member for Hackney had declared he had not seen a bug in the East End, but if the hon. Member were to come down to where he lived he would show him that night people sitting on the doorsteps because vermin had taken possession of their houses, and where poor little children were scratching themselves until they made a sore on account of the vermin. He was pleading for poor people who were unable to do anything for themselves. He could assure the House that he had seen rooms with eight layers of paper on, and how was it possible to keep a place of that kind clean? He knew of a case, in the Ann Street area, where the death rate had run up to sixty per thousand. The magistrate was invited to visit the place, and was told that that was the only place where these people could go to, while the owner of the houses said he had made the rooms as comfortable as he could, and had put on a new paper! The local authorities had to apply to the magistrate four or five times before they could get a closing order, and then they had to pay compensation to the owner. Could anyone believe that these poor people could live in such houses in health? [An Hon. Member: Nobody disputes that.] Then why were they wasting time in opposing this clause? The House might have been on the beer long before this time. What the County Council wanted was to cleanse places that were filthy, and surely London was as much entitled to a clause of this kind as any provincial town. He hoped the House would at once pass the clause.

Mr. J. W. WILSON (Worcestershire, N.) said that the Clause dealt with the method of procedure in cleansing verminous places. No layman would advocate two processes at law when one would be sufficient to meet the case. He opposed the Amendment.

Question put, and negatived.

Dr. AMBROSE (Mayo, W.) said he wished to move the omission of Clause 46 by which the County Council took power to supply food to the inmates of their lodging-houses. This was an objectionable example of municipal trading, and direct competition with small traders who catered for the poorer neighbourhoods. There had been a deputation from lodging-house keepers, who lived practically on the profits derived from the sale of food to the inmates of lodging-houses, to protest against this clause. He would withdraw his Amendment if assured that some limit would be placed on the number of municipal lodging-houses, and that the Council did not intend to erect more of them.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 28, line 23, to leave out Clause 46."—(*Dr. Ambrose.*)

Question proposed, "That Clause 46 stand part of the Bill."

Mr. JOHN BURNS said that on the part of the London County Council he could give no such assurance as was asked for by the hon. Member for Mayo. If the hon. Member were to consult his poor compatriots in various parts of London, he would find that they were practically unanimous in favour of the clause. The London County Council only asked the power to cater for the tenants in their lodging-houses, the same as was possessed by any West End club, or by the House of Commons itself. The tenants would have cheaper and better food than at present. As to the small shopkeepers, there was really no ground for complaint, because two-thirds of the food which lodgers consumed was bought off the premises. The power asked for was to provide the lodgers with food when the small shops were closed on a Saturday night or Sunday, or when the shopkeepers were having a holiday. There were 514 lodging-houses in London, and of that number the London County Council had only built and owned two in the last sixteen years. Personally, he was opposed to the London County Council building more. He did not believe in celibate masses of men being crowded in lodging-houses, whether private or municipal; but so long as they had these masses to deal with, it was right to see that they were comfortably kept and obtained food under decent conditions. The London County Council found, just as the late Lord Rowton—who deserved the gratitude of every poor man in London—found with his lodging-houses, that when the catering was left to private enterprise, the food supplied was unsatisfactory, and that the lodgers got margarine instead of butter. It had been said that this was an extension of municipal trading, but Sir Richard Farrar, who was no municipal trader, came forward and begged the Committee to give the London County Council this power. He himself knew that in their two lodging-houses — one at Deptford, and the other near Covent Garden—poor chaps would come in with only a sixpence in their pocket, which allowed them but 2d. for breakfast. It was their duty to see that these poor chaps got value for their money. The Council did not intend to make a profit, nor would the ratepayers sustain a loss. If there was a slight profit at the end of the year, there was no reason why these poor men should not be given a Christmas dinner. He asked the House to endorse the unanimous decision of the Committee.

Mr. HEYWOOD JOHNSTONE said he would ask hon. Members to consider how they would like to have to leave the House of Commons, purchase their own food, and then return and cook it. There was no question of municipal trading involved with the Clause. The Committee, fortified by the opinion of Sir Richard Farrant, who was managing director of the Artisans' Dwellings Company and Chairman of the Rowton houses—a gentleman of unique experience—unanimously came to the conclusion that it would be for the advantage of the administration of these houses and for the comfort of the lodgers that they should have an opportunity of getting what they required provided and cooked for them in the houses in which they lived. Mr. John Hunt, the town clerk of Westminster, gave similar evidence.

Captain JESSEL (St. Pancras, S.) said that as the clause was now drawn there was no reason to fear that the Council would compete with the small shopkeeper. He therefore thought that the hon. Member would be well advised to withdraw his opposition. At the same time, he thought that the hon. Member for Battersea might make a concession in this matter by limiting the clause to these two particular lodging-houses. If the London County Council annexed a number of lodging-houses it would be a special danger in London, because, if men were housed so comfortably they would not get married, and that would be hard on the spinsters of the Metropolis.

Mr. LAWRENCE (Liverpool, Abercromby) said that as a London ratepayer he would protest against the withdrawal of the Amendment. He had never heard a case advanced with fewer or weaker arguments. His hon. friend compared the lodging-houses with the House of Commons. But hon. Members did not make this House their home; and he did not, therefore, see the analogy. The hon. Member for Battersea said that the London County Council initiated these lodging-houses as model dwellings; but that work had happily been carried out by Lord Rowton. The London County Council did not know how far it might be carried. To his mind it was undesirable that the Council should enter into competition with private enterprise in this matter. Neither did he think that it would add to the dignity of the Council; and he wished to protest against the extension of the principle.

DR. AMBROSE said that after the explanation of the hon. Member for Battersea he would ask leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Bill to be read the third time.

LICENSING BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee).

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 1:—

Amendment again proposed—

"In page 1, line 7, to leave out the words 'unsuitable, or.'"—(*Mr. H. D. Greene.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'unsuitable' stand part of the clause."

*MR. H. D. GREENE said he would ask leave to withdraw his Amendment. It was, however, patent that there was great ambiguity in the words he desired to omit. The hon. and learned Member for Dumfries Burghs and the hon. and learned Member for South Leeds had disagreed as to their effect. The hon. and learned Member for South Leeds contended that the magistrates would be entitled under the words to refuse the renewal of a licence if the furniture was bad or insufficient or if the house stood at a corner or near a church or was removed from police supervision. If the hon. and learned Member were right, the Committee had wasted a great deal of time in discussing a previous Amendment with reference to remoteness from police supervision. The Government would vote against his Amendment for one reason; the Opposition would vote against it for another reason; and as there would, therefore, be certain to be a majority against it, he would ask leave to withdraw it.

MR. AINSWORTH (Argyllshire) said he thought it would be very desirable if the Amendment were accepted, as it would have the effect of not only improving the houses, but also the character of the business carried on within them. When the structure of a house was improved, the character of the business was also improved. He would appeal to hon. Gentlemen who were interested in the trade. Was not their great object to advance the cause of temperance and to raise the trade to the highest possible level? Therefore, they ought to seek every opportunity to improve the structure of licensed houses. He would appeal to the Home Secretary to accept the Amendment.

Question put, and agreed to.

MR. BOUSFIELD said it might save time if his Amendment were taken next.

*THE CHAIRMAN: There are eight Amendments before that of the hon. Gentleman.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) said he would be quite willing to give way to the hon. Gentleman.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I cannot pick and choose between Amendments. I will call on hon. Gentlemen in the order in which the Amendments appear. Mr. Whitley.

MR. WHITLEY said his Amendment was to insert after "unsuitable" the words "or of insufficient value." He moved it in order to ascertain whether the Bill would continue or destroy the existing law with regard to qualification in the form of rateable value. It had been suggested to him that unless these words were inserted, the law with regard to rateable value would cease to operate. All he desired was that existing legislation in this respect should not be cancelled by the Bill. It was very undesirable that houses of low rateable value should be licensed. He would ask the Solicitor-General to give the Committee his views on the matter.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 7, after the word "unsuitable,' to insert the words 'or of insufficient value.'"—(*Mr. Whitley*).

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS (Kent, St. Augustine's) thought there was no necessity for the Amendment. Section 44 of the Act of 1872 provided that a licence granted in respect of premises not of the required value was void, and he was satisfied that the Bill did not affect the powers which the hon. Member desired to preserve.

SIR ROBERT REID said that the Committee must, of course, accept the statement of the Home Secretary. Insufficiency of value was a ground for objecting to a renewal; and he agreed that that disqualification was not abolished by the Bill. But what would happen would be that the decision as to qualification would be remitted to quarter sessions, and would no longer remain with the licensing justices.

SIR EDWARD CARSON said that the licence-holder would apply to the brewster sessions, and if the brewster sessions found that the premises were not of the required qualification then the licence would be refused; but the applicant might appeal to quarter sessions. They wanted to make the matter perfectly clear; but if they inserted one disqualification and omitted others it would leave room for argument afterwards. Section 44 of the Act of 1872 would not be interfered with. He would, however, undertake to insert in line 9 after "licence" the words "or on the ground that the renewal would be void."

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said he was not sure that the arrangement in regard to quarter sessions was at all wise. Before the Act of 1872 no qualification was necessary; and there was now no reason why the exemptions in the Act of 1872 should be continued. He thought the words suggested by the Solicitor-General would be advisable.

MR. ASQUITH: I understand the right hon. Gentleman will introduce the words.

SIR EDWARD CARSON: Yes, Sir.

MR. WHITLEY said that on that understanding he would withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. BOUSFIELD, believing that it was of the utmost importance to preserve if they could the present disciplinary powers of the magistrates in their full force, moved the insertion after "unsuitable" of the following words—"or that the licensee refuses or has wilfully neglected to comply with any reasonable requirement of the justices." The magistrates at present had power to ask an applicant for a pledge that any practice which they considered undesirable, such as the negotiating of sailors' advance notes, should be discontinued, and if the request was not acceded to they might, at the next licensing sessions, on consideration of all the facts, refuse the renewal of the licence. It was very desirable that that power should be preserved, and the first part of the Amendment would apply to a refusal to comply with such a demand when the application was first made. The second part would come into force if an applicant promised to comply with the requirement and failed to carry out his undertaking. The object of the Amendment was simply to preserve intact the disciplinary powers of the magistrates. It was impossible to catalogue all the cases in which magistrates in the exercise of their discretion might make some requisition upon applicants for licences; the only way in which the object could be attained was by the insertion of general words such as he proposed. It might possibly be urged that "reasonable requirements" was a vague term, but the word "reasonable" was very familiar to lawyers, and in practice little difficulty arose as to its construction. Magistrates and Judges were reasonable men, and it would be a fairly easy task for them to decide whether or not a particular requirement was reasonable. Personally he would be prepared to trust entirely to their discretion, but, if the Committee were not prepared to go so far as that, the matter might be allowed to go to the High Court on a special case. It had been urged that to bring cases of refusal to comply into the category of licences which might be refused without compensation was too severe a penalty, but that was really where the matter stood at present. The reason the penalty never became operative was simply that the fear of its operation secured the fulfilment of the requirements. It did not at all follow that because the matter was left to the magistrates there would not be compensation. A discretion in such cases might be left to quarter sessions, on appeal, to grant compensation. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 7, after the word 'unsuitable' to insert the words 'or that the licensee refuses or has wilfully neglected to comply with any reasonable requirements of the justices.'"—(*Mr. Bousfield.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir EDWARD CARSON said this was practically the same point which the Committee had discussed in the afternoon, although the words were different, and he would not repeat his speeches showing that where the circumstances were such that the magistrates ought to retain discretionary power they could do so by virtue of the provision that the premises must be well conducted. If the words now proposed were accepted the magistrates would have the power of getting rid of the obligation to compensate. They might arbitrarily require the licence-holders to close their houses at certain hours or on certain days, and who was to say afterwards that any requirement of theirs was unreasonable? Was the Committee prepared to say that a licensee should be deprived of all benefit from the insurance fund to which he had been contributing simply because the magistrates did not approve, for instance, of the tied-house system, and required a licensee to terminate certain agreements? As to the suggested appeal not only to quarter sessions, but to the High Court, he submitted that it was hardly possible to bring up the matter not on questions of law, but on questions of fact, before the High Court.

Mr. BOUSFIELD said he did not suggest it would be necessary; he simply said that might be done as a safeguard.

Sir EDWARD CARSON thought the hon. Member must have believed there was some necessity for it or he would not have mentioned it. Moreover, there was nothing in the Amendment about a qualified discretion to give compensation on the part of quarter sessions, and he could not see how the hon. and learned Member would propose to set it up, or the extent to which the discretion should be given. He really thought the matter had been discussed at sufficient length, and that it was the same question as had been divided upon earlier in the evening.

Sir ROBERT REID agreed with the Solicitor-General that the subject-matter of the Amendment in one form or another had been for a considerable time before the Committee, but they had not yet come to a definite understanding with regard to what ought to be done. The Solicitor General had stated that it was no part of the intention of the Government to diminish the primary jurisdiction of the justices, but it had been shown that in three different matters it would be diminished, and these words effected this—that local justices might continue to refuse renewal, where there had been a refusal to carry out reasonable requirements. That was not provided by the Bill as it stood. He was unable to follow the Solicitor-General in his view as to "reasonable requirements." The right hon. and learned Member was doubtless aware of cases in which there had been ties or relationship between the employer and the manager of a tied house which were contrary to public policy or interest. All tied houses were not bad, but some were, and in certain cases conditions that were inadvisable existed. In such cases the magistrates were able to say that, unless those conditions were altered, they would refuse the licence on the next application, and in that way they were able to exercise their disciplinary powers to prevent abuses of the relations between the tenant and the owner of a tied house. He thought the Solicitor-General would agree that such a case would not, under the Bill, come within the discretion of the magistrates without compensation.

Sir EDWARD CARSON: Not without compensation.

Sir ROBERT REID said it was within the power of the justices at present, and he had understood from the right hon. Gentleman that all such power was to be retained.

Sir EDWARD CARSON: Disciplinary power as regards the conduct of the house.

Sir ROBERT REID said that that was not what he understood the Solicitor-General to say before. At any rate, the direct result of the clause would be to withdraw from the magistrates a power which they had hitherto been able to exercise in the interests of public order and utility. Why should that power be withdrawn? It had nothing whatever to do with compensation. The insertion of the words "and lawful" would meet the case suggested by the Solicitor-General of a requirement to close a public-house between certain hours.

MR. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam) said the question was really whether local magistrates should be allowed, without Parliamentary or other sanction, to create a body of local laws for themselves. If justices on public grounds proposed to create what was really a new local law, he submitted that a licensee who refused to agree to the proposition was really in the position of having his licence withdrawn on public grounds, and was therefore entitled to compensation. If, however, the licensee had given an undertaking to comply with certain requirements and had omitted to carry out that undertaking it would be a different matter; it might then be a question of misconduct. That was a distinction the hon. and learned Member had failed to make.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that the mischief created by the Bill was that in future no undertakings would be given by the publican because he would know that he might refuse to give an undertaking and yet receive full compensation. The Solicitor-General had admitted that the magistrates now could ask for compliance with reasonable requirements from the licensee, and that if he refused they could withhold the licence. In future, under the Bill as it stood, they could not do so. All that this Amendment asked was that the power of the magistrate should be preserved. If the Government refused to do that, they would make it clear that not on one point only but on several points they were filing down the power of the magistrates and increasing that of the licensee, thus making the property more valuable. Amendments of the kind now proposed could have been introduced perfectly consistently with the principle of compensation, and he was at a loss to understand the objection to the words now proposed. The Solicitor-General had instanced demands that were perfectly illegal. Public-houses were compelled by Act of Parliament to be open within certain hours.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The law does not say that.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE submitted that licence-holders were compelled to give refreshment to any wayfarer who might knock at their doors between certain hours, and no bench of magistrates would dream of making a requirement contrary to Act of Parliament.

*SIR J. STIRLING-MAXWELL (Glasgow, College) supported the Amendment, which he regarded as one of first-class importance. The speech of the Solicitor-General showed that he had very little faith in his licensing authorities, as he was unwilling to trust them with any discretion whatever. In the discussion on the Scottish Licensing Bill the Committee asked the Secretary for Scotland to put in powers which would enable the licensing authorities to do legally what they had hitherto done illegally—make requirements to which licensees had to agree before they could be assured that their licences would be renewed. That policy had been carried on in Scotland with the best results. The Secretary for Scotland declined to put such powers into his Bill. He and his friends regretted it; but the Committee must remember that the Secretary for Scotland left what was much more important—the discretion of the magistrates to take away licences when they liked without any special reason. If the whip-hand was left to the magistrates there would be no need to give them power to make special rules, but if the whip-hand was taken away from the magistrates, as it was by this Bill, he thought they ought to be given power to make such rules as they thought necessary when they gave licences. The rules would have no sanction at all unless disregard of them involved the loss of the licence without compensation. The mere fact that the licence could be withdrawn with compensation would carry no weight whatever, because the publicans would have only to combine to resist the rules and the compensation fund would not be sufficiently deep to allow the authorities to withdraw all the licences involved. He hoped that the Government would reconsider the question.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said his hon. friend had unwittingly given an erroneous impression of the attitude taken up by the Government on the Scottish measure. His hon. friend appeared to think that the view taken by the Scottish Office at that time was that there should be an unlimited discretion given to magistrates to place such conditions upon the licence-holder as they might happen to think reasonable. That was the Amendment, but it was not the Scottish Bill. The Government had never denied that they regarded the present Bill as a great measure, first for diminishing the number of licences without hardship, and, secondly, as being likely to improve the conduct and character of the public-houses that remained by giving some kind of reasonable security to the licence-holder. Those were the two objects of the Bill, which they had never for a moment disguised from the House. How would the second of those objects be affected by this Amendment, which contradicted the Scottish measure on a fundamental point? Suppose there was a cranky bench of magistrates "Oh" — was that an incredible supposition? [An Hon. Member: We have a cranky Government.] That might be so, but there were remedies against the errors of a cranky Government. That question, however, seemed to him to be somewhat outside the scope of the Amendment they were now discussing. Take the case of a cranky Bench. Such things had been known. It was really unreasonable to say that a man should lose all security in his holding when the magistrates had gone outside the law, except such security as might be got on appeal to a less cranky Court. This Bill left the offences of the licence-holder exactly where they were; it might or might not be for the public good that additional conditions should be added to the many conditions that now bound him, but that was outside this Bill, and was surely not a matter to be left to the unfettered discretion of the magistrates. They did not want in one district of the county one set of conditions and in the neighbouring county another set of conditions, because in that case the licence-holders would hold their licences under an entirely different tenure. He could not believe that such a state of things would be either good sense or good legislation. By all means let such restrictions be placed upon licence-holders as were necessary in the public interest, but they should not allow benches of magistrates in one district to have an entirely different set of conditions from those which applied to their neighbours probably in the same county.

The Committee should remember what it was doing. They were saying to the licence-holder that his licence was held not upon conditions laid down by the House of Commons, and not even on conditions considered by this House or by any Department responsible to this House, but upon conditions laid down by three or four gentlemen who were directly responsible to nobody, and with regard to whose decisions the only check was an appeal to a legal tribunal. One of the reasons why they were bringing in this Bill was that the security given by the existing system was inimical both in the interests of temperance and in the interests of justice. That might be an erroneous view, but it was the view of the Government, and it was surely unreasonable to ask them in this connection to run counter to the general principles upon which they had framed the Bill. The House ought either to lay down the actual conditions which constituted ill-conduct, or they ought to leave it, under broad safeguards, to some Department of the Government to lay down; but to leave it to individual Benches would, he thought, produce very great hardships. He was perfectly prepared to give the subject his very best consideration, as his hon. and learned friend desired; but no argument had, in his opinion, been advanced which would justify the proposition that they should leave it absolutely to the magistrates to decide what was a reasonable and what was an unreasonable condition, and to make it a penalty of violating that reasonable condition that the man who thus violated it should lose his whole property without compensation. They wanted to remedy such injustice as was attached to that case. He wished particularly to ask the consideration of hon. Members to the fact that they were compelling every licence-holder, whether he liked it or not, to contribute to the insurance fund.

* MR. EMMOTT (Oldham): Is that in the Bill?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Certainly it is.

* MR. EMMOTT: But there is no compulsion.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that if the hon. Member would look at the schedule he would see that the licence-holders were compelled to pay the licence duty.

* MR. EMMOTT: It says that they "may" be compelled by quarter sessions.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that the licence-holder was compelled to insure his property. It seemed to him that, having regard to the fact that they compelled every licence-holder, whether he liked it or not, to contribute to the insurance fund, the introduction of the words "ill-conducted" gave ample scope to the magistracy to carry out the duties imposed on them, and he did not think they ought, unnecessarily and arbitrarily, to throw uncertainty into the whole procedure by adding words such as those of his hon. and learned friend. He granted that there were arguments to be used on the other side, but he ventured to suggest to the House, looking to the broad principle of the Bill, that the policy of the Government was based upon equitable considerations, and upon this question he was quite unable to alter the opinion which he had expressed to the House.

MR. WHITTAKER submitted that there were cases where it was obviously desirable that the Bench should be able to impose conditions not provided by law, and that they should be enabled to enforce them. There was the case of boarding-houses in seaside resorts to which licences were granted on the understanding that only those persons *bona-fide* living and boarding in the place should be supplied with drink. If the licence-holders persisted in disregarding that engagement by supplying anybody who liked to go into the place, he submitted that that would be a violation of the condition of the undertaking, and there ought not to be compensation, though under this Bill there would be compensation. There was also the case of hotels where an engagement was entered into that there should be no public bar with a door opening on to the street. Supposing there were frequent transfers and the magistrates found out that the licensed house was a man-trap; the house was doing little business, but it was used to get goodwill out of tenant after tenant. Under the Bill as it now stood if a licence were refused to such a house the owners would be compensated.

AN HON. MEMBER: How much would they be paid?

*MR. WHITTAKER: They would go into Court and show how much goodwill had been paid and get their compensation money on that basis. He was told only recently, by the chairman of a licensing bench that at the last brewster sessions they refused a number of licences where there had been frequent transfers, and at the time of the refusal to renew there were three persons who had been tenants of those houses in the workhouse and another had committed suicide. If houses of that kind had their licences refused the owners ought not to receive compensation. There was a case, recently, of a woman who had been so badly treated as the tenant of a licensed house that the magistrates transferred the licence to neighbouring premises in order that she might carry on the business in which she had been disturbed. That was a case in which the original licence-holder would have to be compensated under this Bill. The Solicitor-General now argued as if the magistrates were going to be eager to refuse compensation. At an earlier stage the argument of the Government had been that unless the justices were allowed to give compensation they would not reduce licences. He asked that some confidence should be reposed in the common sense of the magistrates and in their sense of justice. It was not treating them fairly to talk of "cranky Benches." That bore too much resemblance to the language addressed to the brewers when they waited upon the Prime Minister.

MR. ROBSON (South Shields) said the object of this Bill was to give compensation in cases where a publican lost his licence through no fault of his own, or because the house was not needed. It was never intended that there should be any restriction placed upon the power the magistrates at present possessed, or that there should be any loss of the control of magistrates over the business. There had grown up a practice on the part of the benches of magistrates to demand certain conditions upon the granting of licences. A very good illustration of the power they claimed to exercise was what was done in Liverpool. There the magistrates stipulated that there should be no liquor sold to children under a certain age, and in the case of barmaids and in other directions they were able to exercise a valuable disciplinary authority over the owners of licences. Was it intended by the Government to lessen this power on the part of the magistrates? There was no ground for the contention that the Amendment was an endeavour to revolutionise the law. The intention was only to alter the law in a specific particular. The Government declared that the Bill left the disciplinary powers of the magistrates untouched, yet it really deprived them of the only authority by which they could enforce those powers. That was, indeed, the feature of the Bill. It was no longer a Bill to establish compensation. It was a Bill to limit the powers exercised by magistrates. And the Prime Minister revealed the state of his mind very clearly in his reference to "cranky Benches." This was a Bill not only to protect the publican from the loss of his licence but also to protect him against "cranky magistrates;" that was a very serious extension of the scope of the Bill. What was meant by this phrase "cranky magistrates," except magistrates exercising their discretion in a way which the Prime Minister did not like? The matter was in the discretion of the magistrates, but because the Prime Minister thought it might be "crankily" exercised it was to be destroyed; and the publican was to be put beyond the reach of the magistrates even though they might impose upon him reasonable requirements. He thought the Prime Minister was giving an interpretation of reasonable requirements which was not according to law. The Amendment would only enable the magistrates to put upon the tenant requirements which were reasonable. A suggestion had been made that they should add to the word "reasonable" "and lawful." With the addition of these words there would be no ground for the fears of the Prime Minister. But in the absence of such an Amendment there was a dangerous extension of the scope of the Bill.

*SIR JAMES WOODHOUSE (Huddersfield) said that speaking as one who had had a long experience in the administration of the licensing laws he considered that an Amendment of this kind was necessary. He did not agree that the magistrates at the present time possessed the power which these words would give. Magistrates had constantly desired to grant limited licences such as those which had been referred to by the hon. Member for Spen Valley but there was no power under the Licensing Acts to grant limited licences.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: But there will be that power under this Act.

*SIR JAMES WOODHOUSE said he was afraid that the Prime Minister did not realise the effect of this Bill. In many large towns there was frequently a desire among those who kept restaurants and luncheon-rooms that intoxicating liquors should be sold to persons taking food or other refreshments, but the law allowed no limited licence to admit of this. A custom, however, had been followed of granting a licence upon the licensee giving an undertaking not to use it in the ordinary public-house manner. In such circumstances a bench of justices granted a licence, but after four or five years the applicant sold his licence to a brewer, and the new holder turned the premises into a regular public-house. The Bench with which he was connected granted a licence of this character, and the applicant sold it for a large sum of money to the brewers, and although that licence was granted purely for restaurant purposes it was turned into the full public-house licence.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: But that is misconduct.

*SIR JAMES WOODHOUSE said that was not so, because the licensee came up for a renewal of his licence, and the magistrates, holding that there had been a breach of the understanding upon which the licence was originally granted, refused to renew the licence. The then licensee, however, appealed to quarter sessions, and they said, "We have nothing to do with any conditions imposed by the city justices; all we know is that a licence was granted, and, as no misconduct has been proved, and the premises have not been ill-conducted, we shall grant this renewal." That very licence to-day was a full public-house licence. He put it to the Committee that if the words of this Amendment were inserted it would facilitate the granting of these limited licences.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 146; Noes, 214. (Division List No. 184).

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander Williams
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Cawley, Frederick
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cullinan J.
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Delany, William
Denny, Colonel
Dobbie, Joseph
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herb. John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale)
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hobhouse, RtHnH. (Somers't, E
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W.
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh, N.)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morpeth, Viscount
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Pirie, Duncan V.
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Soares, Ernest J.
Spear, John Ward
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, Thedore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J, H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Bousfield and Sir James Woodhouse.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Foster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, RtHn. Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.

Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A.(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Colomb, Rt.Hon.Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig,Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.
Crean, Eugene
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies,SirHoratioD. (Chatham
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale,Rt.Hon SirJoseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland,SirFred Dixon
Doogan, P. C.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fergusson, Rt.Hn.SirJ.(Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald,Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon.EdwardAlgernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster,Philip S.(Warwick,S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gordon,Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,SirE W.(B'rySEdm'nds
Greene, Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Greene,W. Raymond- (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Groves, James Grimble
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Harris,Dr. Fredk. R. (Dulwich)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords. N.W.)
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson,Sir A. (Stafford,W.)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield, Brightside
Howard, Jn. (Kent, Faversham
Hozier,Hon.James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys. Rt.Hon. Arthur Fred.
Kenyon-Slaney, Col.W. (Salop.
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson,JohnGrant(Yorks.N.R
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants.,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.Charles W. (Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.)
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas,ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner,Rt.Hon.SirFrederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu,Hon.J.Scott (Hants.)
Morgan,DavidJ.(Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Mount, William Arthur
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray,Rt.Hn.A Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan,Col.John P.(Galway,N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.- Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley,Hon.Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stock, James Henry
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col. Sir C.E.H.(Sheff'ld
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt.Hn.Sir WilliamH.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby,Lt.-Col.A.C.E.(Taunton
Whiteley, H (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wortley,Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE NOES —Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

And, it being after Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Friday.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR, in moving the adjournment of the House, said he thought it would be courteous to the House that he should say that he had put down to-night on the Paper a Motion which he would propose on Friday for the purpose of hastening the proceedings on the Licensing Bill.

Adjourned at twelve minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 30*th June*, 1904.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

North Western Electricity and Power Gas Bill. Reported, with Amendments.

Leicestershire and Warwickshire Electric Power Bill [H.L.]. Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to.

City of London (Central Criminal Court House) Bill. Moved, That the order made on the 14th day of March last, "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 16th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2ª; agreed to. Bill read 2ª accordingly and committed.

Manchester Corporation (General Powers) Bill [H.L.]; Bridlington Corporation Bill [H.L.]. Read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Crystal Palace District Gas Bill. Read 3ª, with the Amendment, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Wolverhampton Corporation Bill. Read 3ª, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

Saddleworth and Springhead Tramways Bill. Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; and referred to the Examiners.

Manchester Ship Canal (Finance) Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments to be considered to-morrow.

Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

Preston Corporation Water Bill [H.L]; Shipley Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Scotch Education Department Provisional Order Confirmation (Edinburgh) Bill [H.L.]; Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]. Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Govan Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Caledonian Railway Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Glasgow and South-Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. Read 2ª (according to order), and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899), deemed to have been reported from the Committee. Bills to be read 3ª To-morrow.

Wishaw Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Airdrie Corporation Gas Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill. Read 3ª (according to order), an Amendment made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

Motherwell and Bellshill Railway (Abandonment) Order Confirmation Bill; North British Railway (General Powers) Order Confirmation Bill; Paisley District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill. Read 3ª (according to order), and passed.

Dundee, Broughty Ferry and District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill. Order of the Day for the Third Reading, read, and discharged.

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill; London and India Docks Company Bill; Swindon Corporation Bill; Middlesbrough, Stockton-on-Tees, and Thornaby Tramways Bill; Carlisle Corporation Bill; Clyde Navigation (Works) Bill. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bills; (viz.), M. Camden, E. Mayo, V. Hampden (chairman), L. Lovat, L. Lyveden; agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly. The Committee to meet on Friday the 8th of July next at Eleven o'clock; and all petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

the Bills to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bill.

Leith Corporation Tramways Order Confirmation Bill. A message ordered to be sent to the House of Commons to propose that the Joint Committee do meet in Committee Room B. on Tuesday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Education Board Provisional Order (Cardiff) Bill. Brought from the Commons and read 1ª; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 129.)

PETITIONS.

SUPPLY OF ELECTRICITY BILL [H.L.].

Petitions to be heard by Counsel against; of Metropolitan Borough of St. Pancras; and Local Authorities and Companies owning Electricity Undertakings in Conference; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Regulations for the training of teachers and for the examination of students in training colleges.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3199. Austria-Hungary; No. 3200. United States (New Orleans).

TRANSVAAL (ORANGE RIVER COLONY).

Correspondence relating to the finances of the Transvaal and Orange River Colony.

NATIONAL GALLERY (IRELAND).

Report of the Director to the Board of Governors and Guardians, for the year 1903.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP (VENTILATION: COTTON CLOTH FACTORIES).

Report to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, by F. Scudder, Esq., F.I.E., on air tests in humid cotton-weaving sheds.

MINT.

Thirty-fourth Annual Report of the Deputy-Master and Comptroller of the Mint, 1903.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

LUNACY.

Fifty-eighth Report of the Commissioners in Lunacy, 1904.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1875.

Order in Council of the 23rd June, 1904, appointing the Registrar of the Privy Council to be Registrar in ecclesiastical and maritime causes.

GREENWICH HOSPITAL ACT, 1865.

Order in Council of the 23rd June, 1904, authorising an increase of salary to the cashier and store officer at the Royal Hospital School, Greenwich.

DOCKYARD PORTS REGULATION ACT, 1865.

Order in Council of the 23rd June, 1904, defining the limits of the Dockyard Port of Dover.

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.

Orders in Council of the 23rd June, 1904.—1. Amending the Order in Council of the 19th November, 1902, regulating the currency of Northern Nigeria; 2. Entitled the Somaliland Order in Council, 1904.

COUNTY OFFICERS AND COURTS (IRELAND) ACT, 1877.

Account of receipts and payments under the Act, during the year ended 31st March, 1904.

WOODS, FORESTS, AND LAND REVENUES.

The Eighty-second Report of the Commissioners of His Majesty's Woods, Forests, and Land Revenues, for the year 1903–1904.

RAILWAY COMPANIES POWERS ACT, 1864.

Report, by the Board of Trade, on applications made during the year ended 30th June, 1904, under the Railway Companies' Powers Act, 1864, and of the proceedings of the Board of Trade with respect thereto.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

SUPPLY OF ELECTRICITY BILL [H.L.].

All Petitions referred to the Select Committee, with leave to the Committee to hear parties interested, by themselves, their counsel, agents, and witnesses, so far as the Committee think fit. The evidence taken before the Select Committee from time to time to be printed for the use of the Members of this House; but no copies thereof to be delivered, except to Members of the Committee and to such other persons as the Committee shall think fit, until further order. (No. 128).

A PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

THE MARQUESS OF RIPON: My Lords, before the business begins I wish to ask your Lordships' indulgence while I make a short personal explanation. On referring to the newspaper reports of what took place towards the end of the sitting on Tuesday I find a report of a speech by the Lord Chancellor which shows me that I had not heard his remarks upon that occasion. I am sorry to say that with advancing years I suffer somewhat from deafness, and I certainly did not hear what the noble and learned Lord said. I find that the rule which he laid down with regard to the authority of the Lord Chancellor as Speaker of the House was perfectly in accordance with the view I ventured to take. I feel bound to offer this explanation in order to make it clear that that was the case.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of HALSBURY): My Lords, I am very glad that the noble Marquess has said what he has said, because, although I did not attribute to him any desire to mislead the House, his intervention on the occasion was calculated to mislead some of your Lordships as to what the true rule is. The rule is that the Speaker of the House of Lords, unlike the Speaker of the House of Commons, has no authority to decide what is out of order or what is not. That is for your Lordships to decide. But the Lord Chancellor has the same authority that other Peers have to rise to order, and speaking generally, during the eighteen years I have occupied this position, I have never intervened in any other way. It is always an invidious task to call a noble Lord to order, but unless the Lord Chancellor takes notice of a breach of order nobody else would. One consequence of that is that I am afraid your Lordships' House is not an example of order. When I intervene I do not claim any right to decide a point of order, but only the right to call attention to it.

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT (1894) AMENDMENT BILL [H.L.].

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day or the Second Reading read.

LORD MUSKERRY: My Lords, in moving the Second Reading of this Bill I think the only excuse I need offer is that lives are still being unduly risked through the carriage of dangerous deck loads by British ships in the winter time. Previous representations of mine in this House on the subject have had no effect whatever in official quarters; therefore I am bringing forward this Bill so that we may have a clear issue before your Lordships' House. If I can, as I hope, furnish you with convincing proof that not one only, but very many of our seamen have found a watery grave through this practice of carrying these deck loads in the winter, then I have confidence in your Lordships giving my Bill your most earnest and sympathetic consideration.

As the Memorandum of this Bill states, it is an offence against the law for any vessel to arrive between the last day of October and the 16th day of April at any port in the United Kingdom carrying a deck cargo; that is to say, anything more than deals, battens, or light wood goods not exceeding 3 feet above the deck. There is a certain amount of grim humour in the fact that so long as the vessel does not discharge her deck cargo it is quite open for her to pay a visit to our shores, come into our ports, and get coal or provisions. There is no fear of punishment until such time as she lands a single log, when the machinery of the law is at once put in motion by the Board of Trade. To put it shortly, the law forbids as a dangerous practice the carriage of deck loads to the United Kingdom in winter, but our ships may carry them with impunity to the Continent. Therefore there is not a shadow of doubt that though the law says it is dangerous, the practice of carrying dangerous deck loads in the winter time goes on as merrily as ever. The only difference is that they are discharged on the Continent instead of in this country.

This Bill aims at consistency in the law and involves no difference in point of principle to the statute as it stands at present. In view of the evidence in specific cases I shall adduce, I will not dwell on the serious and unjustifiable risks which our sailors are expected to undertake. If your Lordships have ever observed the condition of vessels arriving at our large seaports with deck cargoes, even in summer time, you will the more fully appreciate the plight of such vessels lumbering across the Atlantic in winter with an enormous incubus above deck which, if breaking loose, will carry everything before it. It is a menace to all concerned. I now propose to deal with the disaster and misery which have arisen out of this practice of carrying dangerous deck loads in the winter time.

As I have never met with anything else, I suppose I must take it as a matter of course that the Marine Department of the Board of Trade will offer determined opposition to the Bill. My noble friend representing the Board will, I have no doubt, go as usual into percentages as to loss of life, but I would exhort your Lordships not to attach too much weight to statistics submitted in this form, for they are calculated to be most misleading. If, for instance, 100 ships carried deck cargoes across the North Atlantic, and it was proved that the deck cargo was the cause of the loss of one vessel, only, with her crew, then the proportion of disaster would be 1 per cent. only. This would appear to be a most insignificant proportion, but, I ask, what about the crew of thirty-five or forty men who have perished through being subjected to unjustifiable risks? Are they not worthy of consideration? Are their lives of no value? If one life, only, is thrown away from a preventable cause, then I contend that, if it cannot be prevented otherwise, the Legislature must step in. We do not wait for a terrible catastrophe on our railways before sanctioning measures to avoid danger. One single instance of loss of life furnishes amply sufficient basis for taking precautions for the avoidance of further sacrifice.

I will now deal with the facts concerning this loss of life which the Bill seeks to put an end to. The ss. "Mobile" was lost with all hands, and it is noteworthy that on the eve of this vessel's sailing from the United States the second officer communicated with his relatives, fearing the consequence of the ship being in such a dangerous condition owing to the huge deck cargo she was carrying. It is also worthy of note that the Merchant Service Guild forwarded copies of these letters to the Board of Trade at the time. The Board of Trade Inquiry—which is a Court constituted under the Merchant Shipping Act, having the advantage of the assistance of two expert nautical assessors—found that owing to her deck load the vessel was sent to sea in an unseaworthy condition. Twenty-six men lost their lives through this disaster. Somewhere about the same time the steamer "Huddersfield" experienced an accident, her deck cargo carrying adrift, and she was placed in a very perilous situation. Some of her crew were seriously injured. The Board of Trade Inquiry which was ordered to investigate the circumstances declared that—

> "This vessel also was sent to sea in an unseaworthy condition."

I might mention that the deck cargoes in both cases were being carried in the winter time to Continental ports. The "Mobile's" deck load of timber was estimated at being not less than 700 tons weight.

Then again there was the loss of the ss. "Cardinal," proceeding in winter time with a deck cargo. The Board of Trade Inquiry ordered to investigate the circumstances found that the loss of this vessel was caused by the deck cargo being washed overboard by heavy seas, carrying away her bulwarks and steering gear, and staving in the after hatches, thus rendering the vessel unmanageable and waterlogged. The Court, in giving judgment, said that—

> "Although the Merchant Shipping Act does not apply to a vessel like the 'Cardinal' bound to a Continental port in the winter time, still, having regard to the weight of the deck cargo carried and to the length and size of the great proportion of the pitch-pine logs of which it consisted, the Court is of opinion that the vessel, as laden, was not in a good and seaworthy condition when she left Pensacola on a winter voyage across the North Atlantic."

It was the opinion of the Court that the vessel was rendered unmanageable and lost by the weight and size of her deck cargo. Then, again, the report of the Board of Trade Inquiry which investigated the circumstances of the accident to the steamer "Firth of Forth" contains instructive reading on this matter of the carriage of deck loads. I do not wish to infer for one moment that the particular accident—a stranding—which was inquired into was caused by the deck load which she was carrying from the United States to the Continent; but, as furnishing proof of the statements contained in the Memorandum to the Bill, I may say that the annexe to the report of the Board of Trade Inquiry into this matter states that previous to the stranding of the vessel I have mentioned she had a list which increased considerably until she was almost on her beam ends. After a consultation with the chief officer, the master decided to cut the lashings and sacrifice the deck cargo. This is a performance much more difficult than might be imagined, and I have no hesitation in saying that if it had not been attended by good fortune the ship herself would have been sacrificed, and in all probability her crew as well.

Then comes the case of the loss of the "Blenheim," under the management of Messrs. Steel, Young & Co. of London. A Board of Trade Inquiry was ordered, and after hearing all the evidence, formulated their judgment. They found that the vessel met with heavy weather and consequently the deck load shifted, causing a great list to starboard and the vessel to ship large quantities of water. The Court stated that the cause of the deck load breaking adrift and the vessel taking a list to starboard was that she listed heavily and was struck by a heavy sea on the port side. Great damage was sustained by the vessel then and thereafter, and the Court stated that although they would have been of practically no assistance, no fewer than three of the deck pumps were inaccessible in consequence of the deck timber being stowed over them. They said that this disaster showed the wisdom of the statutory regulation that—

> "Vessels shall not carry deck loads of timber to discharge at ports in the United Kingdom in winter."

I would supplement this by the remark that this disaster shows the desirability of your Lordships giving your favourable consideration to this measure, which would prevent such vessels carrying deck-loads to the Continent.

The latest glaring case to which it is my painful duty to draw your Lordships' attention is the loss of the steamer "Salopia" together with her crew—twenty-two men all told. It is a very extraordinary thing that this vessel belonged to the same owners as the steamer "Blenheim," the loss of which I have already commented upon. I desire, however, to be perfectly fair in this matter and to say that the Board of Trade Inquiry added that the managing owner of this latter vessel—the "Salopia"—on signing the charter party of the vessel was not aware of the loss of the "Blenheim." It appears that he has declared he is determined not to carry winter deck cargoes in vessels of this class, but the Court very tersely stated that this does not seem to go far enough. I would ask your Lordships to support me in preventing other shipowners from carrying such deck cargoes, so that this particular owner may not have to meet with what he would consider as unfair competition. From the judgment of the Board of Trade Inquiry it appears that this missing steamer "Salopia" carried on deck no fewer than 585 logs. The Court highly disapproved of carrying a deck load during the winter months, stating that at this period of the year no deck load ought to be carried, and there is no beating about the bush in a plain statement of this character.

Your Lordships have heard on several different occasions when I have brought shipping matters forward replies by the noble Lord representing the Board of Trade in this House to the effect that the master of a ship must be allowed discretion in these matters. To those who know anything about the methods of present-day merchant ships this so-called discretion of the shipmaster is a hollow mockery. He is governed by custom and by the orders of his owners. If he does not load the full amount which the custom of the port indicates then on arrival home he is displaced by another master, but for obvious reasons the cause is not assigned. Shipmasters are therefore "between the devil and the deep sea." Their living must be their first consideration; therefore, in their anxiety to retain their positions, they carry full deck loads which, according to the disasters I have mentioned, constitute their vessels as unseaworthy and unfit for sea.

In furnishing your Lordships with independent proof of my statement on this point of "discretion," I will mention evidence which came out at three different Board of Trade Inquiries. In the case of the steamer "Cardinal" the owners wrote the captain that they desired him to carry as much as he could, safely and legally. It would have been all well and good if the owners had ended with this, but they proceeded to inform the master that if he went to the Continent they thought he was entitled to carry a larger quantity than to the United Kingdom; and if he was not acquainted with the custom in such cases he could procure authentic information at Pensacola where timber carrying is a speciality. In the face of such instruction and of the recognised custom, it is obvious that the master had no alternative but to carry a dangerous deck cargo. In the case of the loss of the "Blenheim," the owners wrote to the captain to say that the home market was simply in a desperate condition and they feared the present voyage was going to be a very poor one but they relied upon him doing his best to prevent a loss and hoped that a good cargo would be shipped. They pointed out that of course he would be allowed to carry a full deck load for the Continent compatible with the steamer's seaworthiness, and they trusted he would take full advantage of this liberty. Of course such instructions leave a loophole for escaping responsibility for the shipowners, but here again your Lordships will judge as to what discretion the master really had. He had absolutely none.

Lord Muskerry.

At the recent inquiry into the loss of the "Salopia" with all hands, the owners stated candidly that they expected the captain to take a deck cargo, but they left it to him to load her compatible with her seaworthiness. One of the nautical assessors on the Court, in reply to this statement, said that the captain depended upon the owners, and would carry perhaps a little more rather than incur their displeasure. The assessor pointed out that it was no more safe to carry deck cargoes to a foreign port than it was to an English port. I think I have adduced sufficient authority for saying that, although pains and penalties are visited upon the master, he has no discretion left to him in avoiding them.

I do not desire to trespass unduly on your Lordships' forbearance, and consequently I will not deal with the many letters received from shipmasters and officers appealing to me to help them in this matter by bringing it before your Lordships. I would wish to impress upon your Lordships the fact of their deplorable position in this matter. Their bread-and-butter must be their first consideration. If they do not follow the recognised custom they lose their positions on arrival home. Therefore I say that it is a grievance that demands remedy. Though they have no option as to carrying deck loads, they are yet held chiefly responsible. The Merchant Service Guild, which represents eleven thousand certificated captains and officers of merchant ships, has urged me to bring this subject before your Lordships, and to state how strongly they feel on this matter. The facts they have placed in my hands are such as no man possessing an atom of feeling can disregard. It is the captains and officers of our merchant navy upon whose practical experience we must rely in preventing undue risks to life on the high seas. If, as in this case, they emphatically condemn the carrying of deck cargoes in the winter time, your Lordships cannot but attach considerable weight to their representations—backed up as they have been by decisions, such as I have quoted, of legal Courts which have fully investigated certain disasters at sea caused by deck cargoes.

If, as I have foreshadowed, my noble friend representing the Board of Trade opposes the Bill, it is practically a certainty that the fine old crusted argument of foreign competition will be urged. Where this competition is at the expense of the lives of our seafaring fellow-subjects it is a question to be dealt with by the State. It seems to me an extraordinary argument that if foreign ships are allowed to proceed to sea in an unseaworthy condition, then it should—on the score of "competition"—be permissible for British ships to do likewise. The Board of Trade and the shipowners seem to be the only people who can convince the Legislature that "two blacks make a white." I always thought that Great Britain led the way in promoting safety of life at sea. Nowadays the tendency is to wait for the foreigner to make the first move. Norway is, I think, our only competitor to be considered seriously in the carriage of deck cargoes. I may inform your Lordships that the Norwegian Government have now adopted a measure stipulating that vessels carrying wood on deck must hold a surveyor's certificate as to their fitness to do so, and that the deck load must be so stowed as not to impede navigation or prevent free access to boats and other life-saving appliances. Norway, your Lordships will see, is quite impressed by the dangers of such cargoes.

Should your Lordships give this Bill a Second Reading, it will of course be open to Amendment in Committee. I implore your Lordships not to disregard, not my own views, but those of independent and impartial authorities on a cause of deplorable loss of life at sea. The fact that they have no direct means of representation in the Legislature should cause their claims to appeal to us all the more. Full of toil, care, responsibility, and risk, their lives are as precious to their parents, their wives, and their families as they should be to their country. I ask, then, that these lives should not be unduly jeopardised, and that dangers altogether outside the category of ordinary perils of the sea may be the subject of your Lordships' most earnest consideration.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a."—(*Lord Muskerry.*)

Lord WOLVERTON: My Lords, although His Majesty's Government are not prepared to grant a Second Reading to this Bill, I think I may congratulate my noble friend on the very able and moderate manner in which he has brought this subject to your Lordships' notice. I think it would be as well if I read to your Lordships Section 451 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, which deals with the loading of timber. It runs as follows—

> "If a ship, British or foreign, arrives between the last day of October and the 16th day of April in any year at any port in the United Kingdom from any port out of the United Kingdom, carrying as deck cargo, that is to say, in any uncovered space upon deck, or in any covered space not included in the cubical contents forming the ship's registered tonnage, any wood goods as hereinafter defined, the master of that ship, and also the owner, if he is privy to the offence, shall be liable to a fine not exceeding £5 for every hundred cubic feet of wood goods carried in contravention of this section."

And then there is a proviso—

> "Nothing in this section shall affect any ship not bound to a port in the United Kingdom which comes into any port of the United Kingdom under stress of weather, or for repairs, or for any other purpose than the delivery of her cargo."

That, my Lords, is the existing law, and I can assure your Lordships that this section is vigorously enforced by the Board of Trade. During the years 1901 and 1902, there were convictions of twenty-two vessels for contravening this section, seventeen of which were foreign vessels.

As far as I can make out from the Bill and from the speech of my noble friend, he is desirous of including all British ships starting from a foreign port, and whose cargoes are consigned to foreign ports. That is the scope, I think, of his Bill. The noble Lord has mentioned in support of his proposal many cases where we regret there has been loss of life, and others in which the ship has foundered, but in which there has been no loss of life. I have particulars of all the cases he referred to, with the exception of that of the "Cardinal," and I find that the cause of their loss is not attributed altogether by the Commisioners who inquired into the cases to their carrying deck cargoes. In the case of the "Mobile," which the noble Lord mentioned first, the Court found that the vessel had insufficient stability, but, as she was chiefly laden with grain or cotton, she is not included in the table of timber-laden vessels foundered and missing. The next case to which the noble Lord referred was that of the "Huddersfield." In the case of this vessel the Court found that the casualty was due to the excessive height of the deck cargo. With regard to the "Salopia," the Court found that apart from the vessel carrying a deck load she was not unseaworthy, and they expressed the opinion that no deck load should be carried in winter months across the Atlantic.

I think I can show your Lordships by quoting the figures on this subject, that there has been a great diminution in the number of vessels lost from this cause. The number of lives lost in foundered timber-laden ships during the last four and a half years, was seventy-three, as against 327 in the previous four and a half years. As regards the trade between foreign ports, the number of vessels foundered and missing was eleven, and the number of lives lost fifty-five, during the past four and a half years; as against nineteen vessels, and 125 lives lost, in the preceding four and a half years. This very large diminution is chiefly due, I think, to the employment in this trade of steamers, which have largely taken the place of sailing vessels. In the figures I have quoted, I have not included the twenty-six lives lost in the "Mobile," for the reason I have given.

I now come to the question of foreign competition. As your Lordships are aware, foreign competition in the seafaring world is very keen, and if your Lordships grant a Second Reading to this Bill you will be doing a thing that you have never assented to before—you will be placing restrictions on British ships which you are unable to impose on ships of foreign nations. I admit that if we could get all foreign nations to adopt Section 451 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, it would be extremely desirable, but before that could be done we should have to approach those Powers on the subject. The noble Lord made, I think, a rather strong attack on shipowners. I am not able, I must admit, to follow the noble Lord into that question, but I cannot help saying that in my opinion the general body of shipowners in England are only too anxious to do what they can for the safety and comfort of the men who go to sea in their vessels. I regret that His Majesty's Government are unable to consent to the Second Reading of this Bill.

THE DUKE OF RUTLAND: My Lords, I have no intention whatever of entering into the technical details of this Bill, but when I hear competition alleged as a reason why it should not be read a second time my memory goes back to the great and prolonged debates in the House of Commons on the subject of factory legislation. The great argument of Mr. Bright and Mr. Cobden, and even of Sir Robert Peel, against the passing of the Ten Hours Bill was that it would subject English manufacturers to unjust competition with their foreign competitors. That was the ground of the great resistance made to those remedial measures of that time, and it seems to me that the argument of the noble Lord in opposition to this Bill is based upon precisely the same ground—the dread of foreign competition. Well, we faced it in the case to which I have referred and we conquered, and I see no reason why we should not face it and conquer in the present instance.

THE EARL OF TANKERVILLE: My Lords, I think we ought to look at this Bill from quite a different standpoint from that from which the noble Lord who represents the Board of Trade appears to regard it. Shipmasters are practically forced to take these deck loads, otherwise they lose their positions; and the noble Lord who moved the Second Reading of this Bill has quoted the case of an officer writing home before starting on the voyage, expressing his fear that he would not reach the other side. The case of the Spanish ship "Vesper" has not been alluded to this afternoon. That case was tried last Friday, and resulted in judgment for £40 and costs. The offence took place on April 6th, and that vessel since that time has made two round trips. One would like to know why the Board of Trade put off trying that case for so long, and whether they proceeded with it because this Bill was coming up. I think, my Lords, the case of the poor man who risks his life on our merchant ships should be listened to, the more so as he is a man who has served his country well. We employed, I believe, 600 ships of the mercantile marine during the Boer War. They carried 1,250,000 tons of food, not including forage; they carried many thousands of horses and mules, and 500,000 men without the loss of a single life. Not only have they served us well in the past, but the officers and men of the merchant service will be the men who, in the event of war, will be drawn upon for the Naval Reserve. Surely, therefor, it is worth the country's while to pay some attention to the appeal which these men now put forward to have their case considered from the point of view of the seaman rather than from that of the owner, whose only fear is for his pocket.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of LANSDOWNE): My Lords, I desire to say one word only with reference to what fell from the noble Duke behind me. I did not understand my noble friend who represents the Board of Trade to argue that this Bill should be refused a Second Reading merely because it had the effect of imposing restrictions upon British shipping which did not apply to the shipping of foreign nations. Where the safety of human beings or, indeed, where the welfare of human beings, is at issue, I conceive that we should never shrink from taking the precautions which humanity demands merely because the effect of those precautions would be to throw some disability or disadvantage upon the persons upon whom we impose them. But what I did understand my noble friend to suggest was this, that the number of casualties arising from the careless use of these deck loads was showing a steady and satisfactory diminution, and, that being the case, and as there are already under the existing law restrictions applicable to British and foreign ships alike, which are, we believe, operating in a satisfactory manner, my noble friend suggested that it was desirable not to impose a new restriction which would certainly operate exclusively in regard to British shipping, and therefore place the shipping interest, which is, as we all know, competing with great difficulty against the shipping of other countries, at a fresh disadvantage. That, I think, is the argument upon which we relied, and I hope that the noble Duke will not suspect us of being at all callous in the matter of risk of life and safety at sea.

***LORD KELVIN**: My Lords, I think existing legislation is ample proof that our Legislature cannot be accused of callousness in respect to safety of life at sea. We are doing at present not quite all, but nearly all we can in respect to deck cargoes. We allow no ship, British or foreign, to come into a British port with a deck load of wood during the times for which such a cargo is judged inadmissible in respect to safety. We have power over ships coming into our ports, whether they are foreign ships or British ships, and we use that power against both alike. We have power over British ships over the whole sea. We have power over ships loading under the British flag in foreign ports, and it seems to me it would be only consistent with the principles upon which the existing beneficent legislation is founded, that we should not allow British ships—ships under our own control — to take a dangerous deck load during the winter months. To put a deck load on a ship in an American port which has to cross the Atlantic is to court danger. It seems to me that we are bound by the very principles of our present legislation to adopt the provisions of the Bill now before your Lordships' House, and not allow British ships under any circumstances whatever to ship a dangerous deck cargo during the winter months. I hope the House will give this Bill a Second Reading. I hope the Government and the Board of Trade will see that it introduces no condition whatever that is inconvenient or unfair to British shipowners, unless we are to regard all British legislation unfair which, whether it affects shipowners or manufacturers, places upon British subjects liabilities that foreigners are not subject to. I trust that the Board of Trade will see their way to accept the Bill and allow it to be read a second time.

*THE EARL OF WEMYSS: My Lords, I should like to say a word or two on this Bill. I have been asked by the Shipowners' Parliamentary Committee to do my best to oppose it, but, happily, the Government have not seen their way to accept it, and I hope, therefore, your Lordships will not give it a Second Reading. We all feel that it is desirable that risks should be removed as far as possible, but there is another consideration, namely, the question of the trade of the country; and, in the opinion of the shipowners, if this Bill passes, the timber-carrying trade will be absolutely taken away from this country and go into foreign hands. I cannot conceive a greater misfortune to those whom you wish now to benefit by this Bill than that so important a trade as the timber trade should go into foreign hands. I called attention when the fiscal question was under discussion to the fact that the high figure of British freights was very largely due to what foreigners are free from, namely, well-intentioned, but what I think in many cases is short-sighted interference with those who carry on this trade. I remember that at one time something was proposed by the Board of Trade which the shipowners of this country considered so fatal to their interests that they went to the Board of Trade and told them simply this, that if such a measure was passed they would remove their ships from the British flag and place them under the Norwegian or Spanish or other foreign flag. Therefore, in these matters it it is all very well to give way to one's natural feelings, but there are more serious considerations, and very often when you are trying to do good it turns out to be short-sighted philanthropy, for you do more harm to those you are intending to benefit than good. I hope the Second Reading of the Bill will not be agreed to.

THE MARQUESS OF RIPON: My Lords, it is not often my good fortune to agree with the noble Earl who has just sat down on questions of this sort. Naturally, I should be altogether inclined to sympathise with the object of the Bill which has been brought in by Lord Muskerry. I think its objects are good, and if it were not that it is undesirable to take the steps which he advocates until you have exhausted all other means of arriving at a satisfactory solution of this question, I should have been very much tempted to vote with him. But it does appear to me that it is very desirable, before you adopt a measure of this kind, which might seriously affect British shipping interests, that you should exhaust every effort in your power to induce foreign nations to come into this arrangement. I have some reason for thinking that there is not altogether unwillingness on the part of foreign countries to adopt our principle of legislation, and I cannot vote for the Second Reading of this Bill until the noble Marquess opposite has had the fullest opportunity of inducing foreign countries to adopt our principle in this respect.

LORD MUSKERRY: My Lords, with regard to what has been said by the noble Marquess who has just sat down, I would like to call attention to the fact that the winter is now coming on and that while we are waiting, before adopting preventative measures, for other countries to come into line we are unjustifiably risking a number of lives. When the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs rose, I was overjoyed to hear his first few sentences, for I made sure he was going to support my Bill. The noble Marquess said we should take every care for the safety of life irrespective of anything else. The effect of his observations was that the first object should be the safety and the welfare of seamen. I would point out that this Bill does not alter the existing law except in this one respect—the law says now that it is dangerous to carry these cargoes to England, forbids their being carried, and provides a punishment for infringement, and all that Parliament is asked is to extend this to British vessels going from a foreign port to a port on the Continent. Is not that perfectly consistent? You say that here is a practice which is dangerous, and yet you allow it in cases where the vessel is bound for the Continent. I am compelled to press the Bill to a Second Reading.

On Question, their Lordships divided :—Contents, 13 ; Not-Contents, 26.

CONTENTS.

Northumberland, D.
Rutland, D.

Craven, E.
Dartrey, E.

Powis, E.
Romney, E.
Tankerville, E.

Clanwilliam, L. (*E. Clanwilliam*)

Ellenborough, L.
James, L.
Kelvin, L.
Lyveden, L. [*Teller.*]
Muskerry, L. [*Teller.*]

NOT-CONTENTS.

Halsbury, E. (*L. Chancellor.*)
Vane, E. (*M. Londonderry.*) (*L. President.*)
Salisbury, M. (*L. Privy Seal.*)

Marlborough, D.
Portland, D.

Lansdowne, M.
Ripon, M.

Carrington, E.
Denbigh, E.
Hardwicke, E.
Mansfield, E.
Stanhope, E.
Waldegrave, E. [*Teller.*]

Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore*)

Balfour, L.

Calthorpe, L.
Crawshaw, L.
Hawkesbury, L.
Killanin, L.
Kilmarnock, L. (*E. Erroll.*)
Kintore, L. (*E. Kintore.*)
Lawrence, L. [*Teller.*]
Ravensworth, L.
Ribblesdale, L.
Wemyss, L. (*E. Wemyss.*)
Wolverton, L.

OPEN SPACES BILL [H.L.].
MERCHANT SHIPPING BILL [H.L.].
RESERVE FORCES BILL [H.L.].

Amendments reported (according to order), and Bills to be read 3ª To-morrow.

PRIVATE LEGISLATION PROCEDURE (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1899.

Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House as the panel of Lords to act as Commissioners under the Act, viz.:—E. Mansfield, L. Kintore (*E. Kintore*); agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly.

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Six o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 30*th June*, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Great Northern Railway Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Matlock and District Gas Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Selby Urban District Council Bill (by Order). Consideration, as amended, deferred till Monday next.

Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Bill [Lords]; Cardiff Railway Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP No. 11).

Sir William Holland reported from the Committee on Group No. 11 of Railway Bills; That, at the meeting of the Committee this day, a letter was received from Mr. John Howard, one of the Members of the said Committee, stating that he was unable, on account of illness, to attend the Committee this day.

Report to lie upon the Table.

Filey Improvement Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments, from the Police and Sanitary Committee [Section B]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Commons Regulation (Merrow) Provisional Order Bill; Commons Regulation (Oxshott) Provisional Order Bill; Land Drainage Provisional Order Bill, without Amendment.

Southend-on-Sea Gas Bill; Brymbo Water Bill; Great Central and Midland Joint Railways Bill; Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill; Birkdale Improvement Bill, with Amendments.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confer further powers upon the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of the City of Manchester with reference to the construction of waterworks and streets, and otherwise for better local government and improvement of the city, to extend the city, and to make provision with reference to the borrowing powers of the Corporation; and for other purposes." [Manchester Corporation (General Powers) Bill [Lords.]

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to make further and better provision for the health, good government, and improvement of the borough of Bridlington; and for other purposes." [Bridlington Corporation Bill [Lords.]

Leith Corporation Tramways Order Confirmation Bill. That they propose that the Joint Committee appointed to consider the Leith Corporation Tramways Order Confirmation Bill, do meet in Committee Room B on Tuesday next at Twelve of the clock.

Ordered, That the Committee of this House do meet the Committee appointed by their Lordships as proposed by their Lordships.

Message to the Lords to acquaint them therewith.

Manchester Corporation (General Powers) Bill [Lords]; Bridlington Corporation Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; from Abbots Langley; Abersychan; Alva; Ashley; Astley; Atherton; Bardney; Barkston; Balcombe; Barry; Barry Dock; Beck Row; Bell Quay on Tyne; Birkenhead (six); Bideford; Blackheath; Bridge of Allan; Bruton; Burnbank; Burnt Fen; Carthorpe; Castle Cary; Colsterworth; Commondale; Copley; Copperhouse; Cowbridge; Crowd Hill; Ditcheat; Durley; Eastleigh; Eriswell; Evercreech; Falkirk; Gateshead (two); Glasgow; Grangetown; Great Gonerby; Great Ponton; Hamilton; Harleston; Hazel Grove; Heswall; Hexham; Hinckley (two); Holywell Row; Howden; Kingsland; Kingswood; Larnyat; Leigh (four); Liverpool; London; Lower Tranmere; Mildenhall; Newcastle; Newcastle-under-Lyme; North Biddick; North Cadbury; Oakworth; Paddington; Pembroke Dock; Pentre; Pickworth; Pitcombe; Pontlothyn; Releath; Rhosyn yr Hafod; Roaches; Rochdale; Roche; Rosemelling; St. Peter's Quay; Saltfleetby; Scarlop; Soham; South Molton; South Witham; Springwell; Stenalees; Stoke-upon-Trent; Stonehouse; Stourbridge; Team Colliery; Tow Law; Usworth Colliery; Wallsend-on-Tyne; Walton le dale; Washington; Wath-upon-Dearne; West End; Weston; Woodhouse; Wrekenton; and Ynyshir; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petition from Oxford, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

SHOPS BILL.

Petition from Grangemouth, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SHOP HOURS BILL.

Petition from Paddington, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

VALUATION BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Guisborough (two); and Cheltenham; to lie upon the Table.

VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS ACT, 1897.

Petition from Sheffield, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

RAILWAYS.

Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade on applications made during the year ended 30th June, 1904, under The Railway Companies' Powers

Act, 1864, and of the Proceedings of the Board of Trade with respect thereto [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 235.]

MINT.

Copy presented, of Thirty-fourth Annual Report of the Deputy-Master and Comptroller of the Mint, 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS SECURITIES.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 16th June; *Mr. Victor Cavendish*]; to lie upon the Table and to be printed. [No. 236.]

WOODS, FORESTS, AND LAND REVENUES.

Copy presented, of Eighty-second Report of the Commissioners, dated 29th June, 1904 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 237.]

DOCKYARD PORTS REGULATION ACT, 1865.

Copy presented, of Order in Council, dated 23rd June, 1904, defining the limits of the Dockyard Port of Dover [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.

Copy presented, of order in Council of the 23rd June, 1904, entitled The Somaliland Order in Council. 1904 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.

Copy presented, of order in Council of 23rd June, 1904, amending the Order in Council of 19th November, 1902, regulating the currency of Northern Nigeria [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

GREENWICH HOSPITAL ACT, 1865.

Copy presented, of Order in Council of 23rd June, 1904, authorising an increase of salary to the Cashier and Store Officer at the Royal Hospital School, Greenwich [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1875.

Copy presented, of Order in Council of 23rd June, 1904, appointing the Registrar of the Privy Council to be Registrar in Ecclesiastical and Maritime Causes [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK (REGULATIONS).

Copy presented, of Post Office Savings Bank (Constantinople and Smyrna) Regulations, 1904 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

CONTINENTAL FREE PORTS.

Return ordered, "specifying the Ports on the Continent which are Free Ports, and giving the following information with respect to each of these Ports :

(1) Area of the Free Port.

(2) Whether the Free Port is portion of a larger Port area.

(3) Entries and Clearances of Foreign-going Shipping during the past ten years (a) in the Country to which the Free Ports belongs; and (b) in the Port of which the Free Port forms a part.

(4) Whether there is any and, if so, what taxation of goods loaded or discharged in the Free Port.

(5) What are the arrangements for the collection of Import and Export Duties on goods passing between the Free Port and the General Customs jurisdiction of the Country.

(6) Nature of inspection under which loading or discharge is carried on in the Free Port.

(7) Classes of Trade (transit or otherwise) for which the Free Port is mainly used."—(*Mr. Charles McArthur.*)

COUNTY COURTS (PLAINTS AND SITTINGS).

Address for "Returns from every County Court in England and Wales of the total number of Plaints, etc., entered in each Court from the 1st day of January to the 31st day of December, 1903, both days inclusive, distinguishing those not exceeding £20, those above £20 and not exceeding £50, and those by agreement over £50." "And, of the Sittings of the County Courts in England and Wales holden before the Judges of such Courts in the year 1903 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 271, of Session 1903)."—(*Mr. Cochrane.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Accident at Works of Messrs. Jos. Cook and Sons—Fencing of Machinery.

MR. TENNANT (Berwickshire): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to the death of a workman named Richard Drummond, which took place on Saturday, 11th June, at the works of Messrs. Jos. Cook and Sons, at Washington Station, through his clothes being caught by the shafting of an engine; and whether he has given instructions for the more efficient fencing of this shafting.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) My attention had not been drawn to this case, and I do not gather from the Question that the accident, though most regrettable, possessed any exceptional features. I have no doubt that the inspector, in the ordinary course, on receiving the report of the accident, inquired into the circumstances and took such steps with regard to the fencing of the machinery or otherwise as were necessary. I will call for a report and verify this.

French Government and North Sea Fisheries Investigation.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, seeing that the Government of Sweden were unable in 1899 to induce the French Government to participate in the North Sea Fisheries Investigation, will the British Government consider the expediency of inviting the French Government to take part in the scheme, especially in view of the fact that France equally with other countries will benefit through any information in regard to fish habits that may be gained.

(*Answered by Earl Percy*): We have no reason to suppose the French Government would accept the invitation to participate in the North Sea Investigation at our instance, seeing that they declined when invited by the Stockholm Conference.

Prohibition against Macedonians and Bulgarians Moving to other Parts of European Turkey.

MR. MOON (St. Pancras, N.): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the prohibition against Macedonian or Bulgarian inhabitants of the three vilayets moving to other parts of European Turkey has now been removed or relaxed, so as to admit of such persons entering Constantinople itself and working there at their usual seasonal occupations.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) The Grand Vizier promised Sir Nicholas O'Conor on the 13th of June that he would issue orders for permission to be granted to enable the refugees who recently returned to Macedonia to circulate freely in search of work, should they desire to do so.

Naval Volunteers—Instructors and Travelling Expenses.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that, because of their failure to provide a sufficient number of instructors to the Naval Volunteer divisions, the Volunteers themselves are, in several cases, paying coastguardsmen to give the instruction necessary to enable them to earn their capitation grants; and whether, seeing that the Naval Volunteer regulations contain no provision for paying the travelling expenses of the men to and from their rifle ranges or boating grounds, and that a number of the Volunteers are working men upon whom such financial burdens press heavily, the recommendations set forth in paragraph 57 of the Report of the recent Royal Commission on the Militia and Volunteers will apply to the Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) The Admiralty have had the temporary difficulty in regard to instructors for Naval Volunteers brought to their notice; and it is believed that it is now practically overcome. They are not aware that any company of Naval Volunteers is now without an instructor except in the case of one company in the Clyde division, to which a man has been nominated, and his appointment is now under consideration. The Admiralty has approved the grant of an allowance to meet the expense of travelling to boating grounds, gun drill places, and rifle ranges.

Combined Office of Chaplain and Naval Instructor.

MR. LYELL (Dorsetshire, E.): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty in how many of His Majesty's ships are the appointments of chaplain and naval instructor held by different persons; and whether, in view of the importance of cabin space, the Admiralty will give directions that in future no chaplain shall be appointed who is not qualified to act as naval instructor.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) There are 21 of His Majesty's ships in which the appointments of chaplain and naval instructor are held by different persons, and 27 where the two offices are combined in the same individual. The Admiralty recognise the desirability of utilising the cabin accommodation in sea-going ships to the fullest extent, but as there is considerable difficulty in obtaining the services of chaplains who are also qualified to act as naval instructors, no strict rule can be laid down.

County Boroughs with Populations below 50,000.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he would state the number of existing county boroughs with populations below 50,000 in England and Wales.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) There are nine county boroughs with a population, according to the census of 1901, of less than 50,000.

Railway Companies and the new Signal Alarm.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the President of the Board of Trade, if he has called the attention of any railway company to the new signal alarm recently submitted to him; and, if so, with what result.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) Since my reply to the Question on this subject addressed to me by the hon. Member on the 12th of last month,† particulars of several inventions of the character referred to have been submitted to the Board of Trade and their inspecting officers, but I am not aware whether these include the invention which the hon. Member has in mind. I cannot undertake to direct the attention of railway companies to any particular invention.

Rateable Value of Post Office Buildings to be Erected on Christ's Hospital Site.

SIR JOSEPH DIMSDALE (London): To ask the Postmaster-General what action the Department propose to take in regard to the payment of rates in respect of the buildings to be erected on the site of Christ's Hospital, in the parish of Christ's Church, Newgate Street; and whether, seeing that Christ's Hospital was only liable to pay on a supposed rateable value £2,488 (in virtue of an Act of Parliament, 35 Geo. 3, Clause 26), he will agree to have the question of the rateage of the whole site reconsidered, in view of the commercial value of the premises now to be erected by the Post Office upon it.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) When the Post Office buildings are erected and occupied the property will be valued in the same way as other Government property is valued, and a contribution in lieu of rates will be given on that valuation.

Minting of Silver Coinage for Crown Colonies.

MR. BAYLEY (Derbyshire, Chesterfield): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if the silver coinage used in the Crown Colonies is minted at the Royal Mint; and, if not, where is it minted.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) The silver coinage used in the Crown Colonies is, so far as possible, coined at the Royal Mint; but when circumstances make it necessary to have it coined elsewhere it is minted under the supervision and control of the Royal Mint in this country. Recent coinages have been carried out at the Mint, Birmingham. Bronze for Hong-Kong.

Right to Photograph Raglan Castle.

MR. McKENNA (Monmouthshire, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he would consider the expediency of abolishing the charges now made for the right to take photographs of Raglan Castle.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxiv., 1155.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) Neither the Treasury nor the First Commissioner of Works has any jurisdiction in the matter, as Raglan Castle is not the property of the Crown.

Beri-Beri in the Port of London.

Colonel LEGGE (St. George's, Hanover Square): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been called to a statement made by Sir Patrick Manson, in an address delivered at St. George's Hospital on 1st October, 1897, that beri-beri is very common in the Port of London, especially among the lascars, and Sidi boys who in many instances form the bulk of the crews of the large steamers trading to the East; whether he can state how many cases are treated annually at the Seamen's Hospital; and what precautions are taken to prevent the spread of the disease.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) My attention has been drawn to the statement referred to in the Question. I am informed that the number of cases of beri-beri treated annually in the Seamen's Hospital in the ten years ended in 1900 averaged twenty-four. The disease is not regarded by the medical officer of the Port of London as infectious in the ordinary sense, and no special precautions are considered necessary.

Indian Cable Rate.

Sir EDWARD SASSOON: To ask the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the results achieved and the responsiveness of the traffic consequent on the last reduction of the Indian cable rate, he will assist the efforts of Lord Curzon for obtaining a further reduction of 2s. a word.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) I should welcome the reduction of the rate to 2s. a word; but, until I am in possession of the figures of the working of the traffic for the financial year 1903–4, which completes the period of three years under the new system, I shall not be in a position to say whether I am entitled to take any action under the agreement with the telegraph companies concerned.

Publication of List of Titled Persons in India.

Mr. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that the edition of the year 1900 of a publication called the Golden Book of India (purporting to contain an alphabetical list of titled personages in India, published first in 1893), states on its title page that it is published by the publishers to the India Office; and, if so, will he say whether the India Office or other Indian authorities have assisted in its compilation or are answerable to any extent for the accuracy of its contents; and, if not, whether there is any intention on the part of Government to publish in the near future an accurate list of titled personages in India.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The title page of the book in question shows that it was published by "Sampson Low, Marston, and Company, Limited, Publishers to the India Office." The first words of the author's introduction are "No official authority attaches to this work or to any statement in it." I am not aware of any intention on the part of the Government of India to publish a list of titled personages in India.

Duties of Royal Irish Constabulary at Ballinagore, County Westmeath.

Mr. SULLIVAN (Westmeath, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any members of the Royal Irish Constabulary stationed at Ballinagore, county Westmeath, are engaged in herding cattle on an evicted farm in that locality; and, if so, whether they are acting in obedience to the directions of their superior officer.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The police do not act as herds at Ballinagore. They do, however, afford protection to a herd employed on an evicted holding there and to the cattle under his charge.

Earnings of the Burtonport Railway.

Mr. McFADDEN (Donegal, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what was the amount of the gross earnings per mile per week of the Burtonport Railway for the half-years ending 30th September and 31st March last; what was the surplus of the gross earnings of the line on the amount paid the Lough Swilly Railway Company for working same; and in what manner has the surplus been apportioned between the parties entitled thereto.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) In answer to this Question I would refer to the verbal reply given this afternoon by my hon. friend the Financial Secretary to the Treasury to the similar Question of the hon. Member for North Donegal.†

Peace Preservation Act in County Donegal.

Mr. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been called to the charge delivered by his honour Judge Cooke to the grand jury at Lifford, county Donegal, whereby he testified to the entire absence of crime throughout the county; and whether, on account of the crimeless condition of the county for years past, he will consider the revocation of The Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act, 1881, at present in force in portions of the county.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The Government do not consider it desirable to revoke the Proclamation of portions of this county under the provisions of the Act mentioned.

Fair Rent Applications and Appeals in the Innishowen District.

Mr. O'DOHERTY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the number of applications for the fixing of fair rents pending hearing by a Sub-Commission Court in the Innishowen district of county Donegal, and the number of appeals from the Sub-Commission and County Court at present pending in said district; when did any Sub-Commission Court sit in the district; and whether, as the majority of the cases have been pending before each tribunal for a number of years, he can say when those concerned may expect their cases disposed of, and if the Appeal Court could arrange to have all Innishowen appeals heard within the district, and not bring, as heretofore, the tenants to Londonderry.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) There are twenty-two applications to fix fair rents pending from the district of Innishowen; seventeen of these appeared on a list the hearing of which was commenced at Stranorlar on the 28th March last, but the actual hearing of these cases has been delayed owing to the illness of the lay Assistant Commissioner for the district. They will, however, be heard at some convenient place in the district, with the remaining cases on the list, at an early date, which will be notified to the parties. Fair rent appeals are pending in only twenty-eight cases from the Innishowen district. A sitting to hear such appeals was last held in June, 1903, when all cases prior to January, 1900, were disposed of. The appeals now pending have all been lodged at various times since that date, and will be listed for hearing on as early a date as possible, having regard to the claims of other places. The Commissioners, however, can give no undertaking to hold their next sitting within that district.

Through Booking of Goods on the Donegal Railway.

Mr. McFADDEN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Donegal Railway Company, which works the Stranorlar to Glenties line, gave for some years after its opening through bookings of goods, etc., to and from the station at Ballybofry on the latter line; that the working company have discontinued the through bookings to and from Ballybofry for some years past, and at present refuse to book goods, etc., at through rates to and from Ballybofry, and that the result of this stoppage of through bookings to and from Ballybofry Station is that goods for Ballybofry are booked to Stranorlar on the working company's line and then re-booked to Ballybofry from Stranorlar, the distance not being half-a-mile, at an extra cost of 3d. per ton to the consignee; and whether, seeing that the traders of Ballybofry have been in communication with the Board of Works on the subject and desire facilities for through bookings to and from Ballybofry; and, in view of the complaints made to the Board of Works by the traders and merchants of Ballybofry, and of the inconvenience caused to them by the want of through bookings to this station, an inquiry will be directed to be held by the Board of Works into the complaints lodged by the merchants of Ballybofry into the conduct of the Donegal Railway Company in the matter, or such steps taken by the Board of Works as will ensure the removal of the alleged hardship at present suffered by reason of the refusal of the company to grant through bookings of goods, etc., to and from Ballybofry.

---

† See page 175.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) I am informed that the facts are substantially as stated. The Board of Works have communicated with the Donegal Company, and suggested a restoration of the through booking arrangements, but the matter appears to be one which those concerned should bring to the notice of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction.

Arrest of Martin Naughten.

MR. O'MALLEY (Galway, Connemara): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that at a special Court held in Spiddal, on the 13th June, at which a man named Martin Naughten was committed to Galway Gaol on a charge of murder, it was sworn that the prisoner had been arrested by Head Constable Gerrity, although the prisoner had actually been arrested and cautioned by Constable Glynn before the head constable's arrival; and, if so, will he explain why Constable Glynn was not produced at the petty sessions to testify to the circumstances of the arrest.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) Constable Glynn formed one of a party of police acting under Head Constable Gerrity. Constable Glynn discovered the prisoner in hiding, but the head constable charged and cautioned the prisoner. Both policemen were close to each other the entire time. The Crown solicitor did not think it necessary to examine at petty sessions both members of the police force, as the head constable's evidence covered every matter of importance.

City of London Imperial Volunteers—Conditions of Service in South Africa.

SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, previous to, or during formation, or subsequent to the completion of the Corps of City Imperial Volunteers, any stipulations, agreement, or understanding were entered into by, or on behalf of, any of its members as to where and how the force should be employed in South Africa, whether at the front or otherwise.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The reply is in the negative.

Purchase of Army Commissions.

SIR SEYMOUR KING (Hull, Central): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, before the passing of the Act for the Abolition of Purchase in the Army, officers, on being granted direct commissions in the Army, paid a sum of money to the Government by way of purchase of such commission; whether any of the officers who so obtained their first commissions in the Army were afterwards transferred for service under the Government of India in the Bengal, Bombay, or Madras Staff Corps, now combined in the Indian Army; and whether, on such transfer, the whole or any portion of the sum paid by such officer for his first commission was credited to the Government of India.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) In reply to the first part of the Question, some officers paid for their first commissions and some obtained them without purchase. The payment, however, was not made to the Government but to the officer whose commission was sold. The reply to the second part of the Question is in the affirmative, and to the third part of the Question in the negative.

Police Raid on Kaffir Mine Compounds at Johannesburg.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has any information respecting a police raid within the past few days on the Kaffir mine compounds of East Johannesburg, and the finding of machete knives hidden in the bedding of each Kaffir; and, if not, whether he will make inquiries respecting the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) I have no information on the subject, but I will make inquiry by despatch.

Coloured Labour in Transvaal Gold Mines.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can state the number of coloured persons employed on the last day of March, April, and May of this year in the Transvaal gold mines, calculated on the same basis as the Return given by him on 26th May last, distinguishing between those in employ and at work.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*)—

Transvaal Gold Mines.

Coloured persons on last day of each month—

	At work.	In employ.
March, 1904	79,569	73,667
April ,,	78,825	73,246
May ,,	(Official Return of Mines Department with these figures not yet received.)	

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Channel Fleet and the Tyne.

Mr. RENWICK (Newcastle-on-Tyne): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, considering that it is many years since the Channel Fleet visited the Tyne, he will endeavour to arrange for it to visit that river during the coming autumn.

*The SECRETARY to the ADMIRALTY (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge): The autumn programme of movements for His Majesty's ships in home waters has not yet been arranged, but the feasibility of acting on the hon. Member's proposal for a visit to be paid to the Tyne will be duly considered when making out the programme.

Drafts for India.

Captain NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state the regiments, batteries, and battalions proceeding to India during the next trooping season, also those regiments, batteries, and battalions which will be called upon to furnish drafts.

*The SECRETARY of STATE for WAR (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.): The following regiments, batteries, and battalions will proceed to India during the next trooping season:—

13th Hussars.

19th, 20th, and 28th batteries of Field Artillery.

62nd, 64th, 77th, and 81st Companies of Garrison Artillery.

2nd battalion Royal Fusiliers.

2nd battalion Cheshire Regiment.

1st battalion Royal Irish Regiment.

1st battalion Highland Light Infantry.

1st battalion Manchester Regiment.

As regards drafts every regiment, battery, and battalion in India or the Colonies will require them during the next trooping season, and in the case of cavalry and artillery the drafts will be found from their groups, and in the case of infantry from their linked battalions.

4th Battalion North Staffordshire Militia accident to Private Hill.

Mr. COGHILL (Stoke-upon-Trent): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he has had any report furnished to him as to the circumstances under which William Hill, of Fenton, a private in the 4th battalion North Staffordshire Militia, was shot at Lichfield last week; and what step he proposes to take to prevent similar accidents occurring in the future, by keeping ball cartridges separate from the dummies supplied for musketry drills.

*Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: No report of this matter has reached the War Office. I am inquiring into the matter.

Sandhurst Examination Fees.

Sir CARNE RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether a sum of £3, with an additional charge of £1, is imposed on every candidate for Sandhurst previous to the examination; what is the object of this impost; and who receives the money.

*Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The fee for such examination in London is £2 and at any other centre £3. This fee is fixed by the Civil Service Commissioners under Order in Council. The object of an examination fee is to meet examination expenses. The money is paid to the Inland Revenue through the medium of stamps and is paid subsequently into the Exchequer.

Re-armament of the Artillery.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what number of new guns will be completed for India in the present financial year, and whether that will represent the entire number required; what number it is proposed to complete for the British Army in the next financial year, and at what cost; and what number will remain to be completed, and at what cost, in the financial year ending 31st March, 1907, when nearly the whole re-armament, together with a large number of reserve batteries, are to be finished.

*Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Twenty-one batteries will be completed for India in the present year, this being the number demanded by the Indian Government. It is not possible to state at present what their future demands will be. It is at present contemplated that fifty-four batteries will be completed for the British Army in the next financial year at a cost of £1,300,000. Seventy-six batteries will then remain to be completed for the British Army in the financial year ending 31st March, 1907, at a cost of £1,850,000, of which sum £550,000 would not be paid until 1907–8.

South Africa—Alleged Conspiracy to Murder Lord Milner.

Mr. LLOYD MORGAN (Carmarthen, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is yet in a position to inform the House as to whether three men have been arrested in the Transvaal on a charge of conspiracy to murder Lord Milner, or any such charge, and whether one of them has been already deported by the police; and, if so, can he state whether the one so deported is a British subject, and, if so, upon what grounds and by what law he was deported; and whether it is intended to bring the others to trial.

The SECRETARY of STATE for the COLONIES (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington): I have not yet received any information from Lord Milner on the subject. I will inquire by despatch.

Beri-Beri in South Africa.

Dr. HUTCHINSON (Sussex, Rye): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in view of the fact that the beri-beri outbreak was first reported in this country more than a week ago, he can explain the causes of delay in receiving news from South Africa, and now give the House full information on the subject.

Mr. LYTTELTON: I gave the House yesterday all the information which I have so far received on the subject. The contents of the telegram from Lord Milner which I read yesterday appear to me to show that Lord Milner and his medical advisers do not regard the occurrence of this not uncommon disease as involving any very special difficulty. This accounts for his not having treated the matter as one demanding urgent communication home.

Mr. CORRIE GRANT (Warwickshire, Rugby): Has the right hon. Gentleman received from Lord Milner any explanation of his failure to answer the cable?

Mr. LYTTELTON: I have answered that Question.

Trading Rights of British Indians in the Transvaal.

Sir MANCHERJEE BHOWNAGGREE (Bethnal Green, N.E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies what reply he has received to the explanation called for from Sir Arthur Lawley regarding the statement made by him, on the 18th May last, that the decision of the Supreme Court of the Transvaal, confirming the trading rights of British-Indian subjects there, will not be tolerated; whether the reply explains why Sir Arthur Lawley made such a statement without the knowledge or sanction of the Secretary of State or Lord Milner; and will he place the Papers relating to this subject on the Table of the House.

MR. LYTTELTON: I have now before me a verbatim report of Sir A. Lawley's speech on this occasion, which I will send to my hon. friend. He will find that he has been misinformed as to its contents, and that the statement attributed to Sir A. Lawley was never made.

Suicide of British-Indians in Natal.

SIR MANCHERJEE BHOWNAGGREE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if his attention has been drawn to the statement in the Annual Report for 1903 of the Protector of Indian Immigrants in Natal that there had occurred in that year no fewer than thirty-one cases of suicide, being at the rate of 741 per 1,000,000; if he is aware that eight of these cases occurred among the free Indian community numbering 51,259, whereas twenty-three were those of the indentured class numbering 30,131, showing that the indentured labourers committed suicide in an overwhelmingly large proportion; and, if so, can he say whether the local authorities have been able to trace the causes to which this voluntary destruction of life is due; and, if not, will he at once order an inquiry to be made by an independent Commission into the matter.

MR. LYTTELTON: I have seen the Report referred to. The rate per 1,000,000 among Indians generally appears to be, from the figures given, 382 per 1,000,000 and not 741 as stated in the Question, the rate among free Indians and indentured Indians being 157 and 766 respectively. The Report states: A magisterial inquiry is made into the circumstances attending each case of suicide, and whenever the evidence tends to show that the fatality in any way resulted from ill-treatment received from an employer or employé, I make a personal visit to the estate and inquire myself into the circumstances. In one instance, and one only, did the evidence tend in this direction, but my own inquiry did not confirm this suspicion. Generally speaking witnesses state that they can give no reason for the suicide, and, if those who are supposed to know decline to give any information, it is impossible in many cases to arrive at even a probable cause. I may say that the general rate among Natal Indians in 1902 appears to have been 333, and in 1901 383, so that the rate for the year 1903 is not altogether exceptional. This rate has been exceeded in Paris. I am not at present able to compare the rate with that which obtains among Asiatic races generally, and I understand that there are no returns of suicide in India. In any case I do not see that on the facts there is any ground for taking the unusual course suggested by the hon. Member.

Expenditure of Maltese Government Department of Charitable Institutions.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can state the total annual expenditure by the Maltese Government Department of Charitable Institutions, including hospitals; how much of this is contributed by the War Office and by the Admiralty respectively; are the military and naval hospitals open to civilians; has he considered the advisability of placing all the hospitals under one central authority; and, if not, will he consider the advisability of placing the civil charitable institutions under the control of a Maltese local government board elected by the taxpayers who support these institutions.

MR. LYTTELTON: The total expenditure of the Maltese Government Department of Charitable Institutions, including hospitals, is estimated in the Colonial Estimates for 1904-5 at £56,337,14,10. None of this expenditure is contributed by the War Office or the Admiralty. The military and naval hospitals are not under ordinary circumstances open to civilians. I have not had under my consideration the questions referred to in the last part of the hon. Member's Question, and I am not aware of any sufficient reasons for modifying existing arrangements.

MR BOLAND: As neither the War Office nor the Admiralty make any contributions to this expenditure, will the right hon. Gentleman consider the advisability of allowing the people of Malta to look after their own hospitals for which they pay?

[No answer was returned.]

Northern Nigeria—Finance.

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies what is the explanation of the increase in the ordinary expenditure of Northern Nigeria from £62,579 in 1900–1901 to £482,889 in 1903–4; what proportion of this expenditure is for armed forces and what is the nature and object of any military expeditions that are now going on; and whether, in view of the amount of the local revenue and of the commerce of the country, and of the fact that the expenditure of last year has been met by a contribution of £50,000 from Southern Nigeria and a Parliamentary grant of £405,000, he can see his way to undertake that immediate efforts will be made to reduce this outlay.

Mr. LYTTELTON: The ordinary expenditure of Northern Nigeria in 1903–4 is estimated at £382,889, not £482,889. As shown in the statement presented to Parliament (Cd. 2101) the expenditure of £62,579 in 1900–1 does not include expenditure amounting to £145,400 on the West African Frontier Force in that year. The expenditure on the Force in 1903–4 is estimated at £167,591 out of the total of £382,889, leaving £215,398 as the estimated ordinary civil expenditure. The reasons for the increase of expenditure are explained in Sir Frederick Lugard's Annual Reports which have been presented to Parliament. No military expeditions are now going on. The local revenue, though expanding, is still very small. No unnecessary expenditure is incurred. It is hoped that the increase of local revenue may admit of a reduction in the grant-in-aid from Imperial funds in future; but no undertaking in the sense suggested by the hon. Member can be given.

Administration of Panna.

Mr. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.); I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he has any objection to let the House know the date and purport of the original and specific Report or communication which induced His Excellency the Governor-General of India in Council, after obtaining the concurrence of the Secretary of State for India, to assume the administration of the Principality of Panna, in Central India, in September, 1901, and to suspend the then Ruling Chief of that State; and, if he has any reasons for refusing to publish such Report or communication, will he state what they are.

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford): The circumstances of the death of the uncle of the late Maharaja of Panna, on the 25th June, 1901, were such that the Agent to the Governor-General ordered the Political Agent to hold a local inquiry without delay. The result of the inquiry was to establish that the deceased had died by poison, and to implicate the then Maharaja in the crime. The report was submitted to the Government of India on the 19th August, 1901, who, on the 1st September, issued the orders referred to by the hon. Member. The views of the Government of India, and the action taken by them on the findings of the Special Commission which was subsequently appointed to investigate the charges judicially, were published in the *Gazette of India,* in a Resolution dated the 21st April, 1902. As to presenting Papers, I agree with the late Secretary of State in declining to do so. It would not be in the interest of the State itself to publish the details. The facts are sufficiently stated in the Resolution published in the *Gazette of India.*

Indian Statistical Department.

*Sir MANCHERJEE BHOWNAGGREE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if there is a separate department or any special provision for the compilation of statistics in India; and, if so, what is the annual amount expended on the work.

Mr. BRODRICK: For the compilation of Indian statistics the Government of India maintains a special department; that of the Director-General of Statistics, and the amount expended on this department in the year 1902–3, the last year for which the returns have been made up, is £6,040. These charges are in addition to those incurred on various establishments for gazetteer and statistical memoirs, railway and river traffic statistics, and provincial statistics; the charges for these in the year 1902–3 amounted to £23,629.

*Sir MANCHERJEE BHOWNAGGREE: Then may I ask my right hon. friend if it is beyond the capacity of a department maintained at so much expense to give the Return regarding labourers in plantations and mines which I asked for on the 14th June?

Mr. BRODRICK: I stated at the time the reasons which in my opinion made it undesirable to do so.

British East Africa.

Mr. BAYLEY (Derbyshire, Chesterfield): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, before granting a charter to any syndicate to control territory in British East Africa, he will lay upon the Table of the House the terms of the proposed grant; and if, before the grant is confirmed by the Foreign Office, an opportunity will be given for the opinion of the House to be taken on the matter; and whether the Government can transfer British territory to a syndicate without the consent of Parliament.

The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.): It is not proposed to grant to any syndicate a charter enabling them to control territory in British East Africa.

Foreign Sailors on British Ships—The "Southern Cross."

Mr. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he is aware that Messrs. Houlder Brothers, shipowners, and owners of the ss. "Southern Cross," have employed a man named Bethel at Antwerp to engage and supply 35 sailors and firemen for the steamer "Southern Cross," which is at present lying in the port of the Tyne; and, if so, whether he can state the nationality of those seamen, if they are able to speak the English language, and the wages these men are to receive per month; and whether, in view of the provisions of the Merchant Shipping Act with regard to the engagement and supply of crews to British ships by persons not licensed by the Board of Trade, he intends to take any action in the matter; and whether he is aware that there is a large number of sailors and firemen unemployed at the Tyne ports.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of TRADE (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central): From the inquiries which I have caused to be made it appears that twenty-eight seamen were engaged at the Consulate General at Antwerp to serve on the "Southern Cross," but it is not clear that Bethel was concerned in the supply of the men. Of the twenty-eight men engaged I understand that six were Germans, one an Austrian, one belonged to the United States, three were Dutch, one Danish, two Swedish, two French, three Greek, seven Belgian, one Italian, and one Spanish. It is reported that they had a fair knowledge of English, and all but three produced certificates of discharge showing service in British vessels. The wages of the eight A.B's were £3 5s., a month, of the eighteen firemen £3 15s., and of the two deck boys £1 a month. Upon the information before me I doubt whether the engagement of the men at Antwerp constitutes an infringement of the provisions of Section 111 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, but the Board of Trade are being legally advised upon the point.

Mr. NANNETTI: And could not sailors have been obtained at the port from whence the vessel sailed?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: I have no reason to think they could not.

Licensing Bill.

Mr. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will state approximately the value of the licensed premises to which the Bill before the House applies; the maximum capitalised amount that could be raised by quarter sessions for the purpose of closing specified licensed premises; the approximate extra value that would be given to the licensed premises remaining by the decreased contribution and by the absolute fixity of tenure secured for a long period.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): I find it extremely difficult to understand the precise meaning of the various parts of the Question: but, so far as I can see, it is impossible to produce any useful figures such as the hon. Member appears to desire.

Swine Fever Regulations in Aberdeenshire.

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.): I beg to ask the hon. Member for North Huntingdonshire, as representing the Board of Agriculture, whether he is aware that while there is no swine fever in the North of Scotland, the Board of Agriculture has brought pressure to bear on the local authorities of the city and county of Aberdeen and counties of Banff and Kincardine to pass a swine fever order, forbidding the movement of swine into or out of their districts except under restrictions, and that these local authorities have, under pressure from the Board, passed such orders; and, if so, will he state the necessity for such orders; and whether, in view of their effect upon the swine trade in these districts, steps will be taken for their reconsideration.

MR. AILWYN FELLOWES (Huntingdonshire, Ramsey): The regulations referred to by the hon. Member were adopted by the local authority on the suggestion of the Board, and they have for their object the protection of the county against the introduction of infection from outside. They do not impose restrictions upon the movement of swine out of the district, and are on the lines of those which in many parts of Great Britain have been found by experience to combine a minimum of restraint upon trade with a maximum of effectiveness against disease. Indeed, it is to their general adoption that the present improved position with regard to swine fever must be largely attributed. The necessity for some such local protective measures, especially in counties themselves free from infection, is well shown by the case of another Scotch county—Ayrshire—where in the absence of efficient regulations no fewer than forty-nine outbreaks of swine fever have recently occurred owing to the introduction of a consignment of swine from England. There is no objection on our part to counties with a clean bill of health combining together to adopt the same regulations and so widening the area in which free movement is allowed. An arrangement of this character will, we understand, be adopted by Aberdeenshire and the adjoining counties.

Licence Fees in North Ireland.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN (Kilkenny, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the amount received annually by the clerk of the peace for the city of Belfast for the registration of the 649 licences to sell beer and spirits in that city amounts to £81 2s. 6d., or since 1874 £2,433 15s., which first-named sum is made up by his charging a fee of 2s. 6d. for each licence; and whether he will state the purpose to which these fees are devoted.

I beg also to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he is aware that the clerks of the peace for the county of Antrim and the city of Belfast are in receipt of a fee on the annual renewal of a publican's licence; and, if so, under what statute are such fees authorised; and whether, under the provisions of Section 17 of the Act of 1874 the payment of any fees whatever in respect to renewal of a licence to sell spirits or beer is prohibited.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): I believe the average annual sum received in respect of fees on licences by the clerk of the peace for Belfast in recent years amounts to about £81. I am unable to ascertain what the fees amounted to so far back as 1874. These fees are, under the provisions of the 10th Section of the Licensing Act of 1833, as amended by the 15th Section of the Licensing Act of 1874, received and retained by him as part of the emoluments of his office and especially in respect of his labour in keeping a register of licensed traders. Section 17 of the Act of 1874 deals with an entirely different matter, namely, the fee paid to the petty sessions clerk on the granting by the justices of their certificates. When the offices of Clerk of Peace and Crown are amalgamated the former fees are retained by the revenue officer and paid into the Treasury under the 16th Section of the Revenue Act of 1898.

Dublin Metropolitan Police—Constable Whyte's Case.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will explain why twenty-seven constables of the Dublin Metropolitan Police have been promoted to the rank of sergeant over the head of Constable T. Whyte, who was their senior and qualified for promotion.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): I am informed that this constable was not promoted because he was not considered to be properly qualified for the rank of sergeant. Seniority is an element, but not the determining element, in considering a man's fitness for promotion.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN: Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will consider the advisability of promoting Constable Whyte to the Custom House Steps staff.

Irish Evicted Tenants—Case of A. P. Doolan, of Shinrone, King's County.

MR. REDDY (King's County, Birr): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the case of Amos Palmer Doolan, who was evicted from his farm at Derry MacEdmund, near Shinrone, King's county, his yearly rent being £142; whether he is aware that the agent became tenant of the evicted holding on the 25th September, 1903, at the yearly rent of £72; and, if so, can he state when Doolan made application to the Estates Commissioners for reinstatement, and with what result; and whether, seeing that the landlord, J. H. Lloyd, has agreed to sell this estate to the occupying tenants, the Estates Commissioners, before sanctioning advances for purchase, will fully investigate the facts and take into consideration Doolan's claims.

MR. WYNDHAM: This property has not yet come before the Estates Commissioners. The evicted tenant named in the Question has applied for reinstatement, and his application will be duly considered.

MR. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.): Is it the case that the agent of the estate now occupies the farm?

MR. WYNDHAM: I believe that is so.

Ballingeary Police Force.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state the number of police at present stationed at Ballingeary; and, seeing that there were only eleven cases from the village tried at petty sessions during the past year, will he explain what necessity now exists for the continuance of this police barrack; and whether the peace of the district could not be efficiently protected from the other barrack in the parish.

MR. WYNDHAM: A sergeant and four constables. The question of the necessity for the continuance of the barrack is one for determination by the authorities locally responsible for the maintenance of the public peace. These authorities do not consider the barrack can be dispensed with at present.

Land Purchase in County Kerry—Alleged Arbitrary Action of Landlords.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on the estate of Mr. G. A. G. Hickson, of Gortullea, county Kerry, who is a middleman under Trinity College, the tenants have been proceeded against for rent at quarter sessions because they refused to agree to the terms of purchase stated by the agent, and that the amount proceeded for includes the hanging gale, which has never hitherto been demanded; and, if so, whether he can do anything to protect these tenants, pending the decision of the Vice-regal Commission appointed to inquire into such cases.

The following Questions also appeared on the Paper:—

MR. MURPHY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of

Ireland whether he is aware that the Receiver under the Land Judge on the M'Cartie Estate, in the county of Kerry, on 22nd June, 1904, issued a letter to the tenants stating that the estate would not be sold for eighteen and a-half years purchase, and that an order had been made to proceed against the tenants; and, if so, will he state whether the Estates Commissioners are negotiating for the purchase of these estates; and, if not, what steps he proposes to prevent such methods of forcing these tenants into unreasonable bargains.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the tenants on the estate of Mr. F. R. Bateman, Tralee, have paid, from 10th March, 1903, to 18th January, 1904, three gales rent, and have now been prosecuted for a fourth gale within a twelvemonth, and that these proceedings have been instituted for the purpose of forcing the tenants to accept the terms of purchase which Mr. Bateman is demanding; and whether any legislative steps will be taken to protect tenants from such exercise of their powers on the part of landlords.

MR. WYNDHAM: This is one of three Questions falling within the same category to which it will be more convenient for me to reply together. I have no official information respecting the matters of fact alleged in the first and third Questions. With respect to the first part of the second Question the Registrar of the Land Judge's Court is not aware whether a letter was issued by the Receiver to the tenants in the terms stated. It is the fact, however, that the Land Judge recently made an Order giving the Receiver liberty to proceed for recovery of the rents on the McCartie Estate, which the tenants were withholding. On the general question I have to observe that the Land Purchase Act does not abolish any rights, either of tenants or landlords, in respect of the payment of rent. Legislation to affect these rights would, in my opinion, be most prejudicial to the successful working of land purchase on the lines laid down by the Land Conference. The hon. Members who put these Questions seem to suggest that a landlord should be debarred from suing for money owed to him pending a sale. The obvious objections to such a course must be apparent, if they will consider the opposite case of a number of tenants asking for a reduction on rent pending a sale. Section 13 of the Act of 1881 amply protects tenants from oppressive proceedings for recovery of rent, and Section 10 of the Purchase of Land Act, 1885, confers on the Land Commission all the powers of a Court of Equity to rescind contracts into which one of the parties has been by duress forced to enter. In addition to these protections, under the Purchase Act of 1903 an inspection in respect of security is obligatory in the cases of all holdings other than those specified in Section 1, *i.e.*, judicial rents inside the zones.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: Arising out of the reply of the right hon. Gentleman, may I ask him if it is not a fact that under the Act of last year sales should be voluntary, and whether in this case the landlord is not now using powers he never possessed before in order to induce the tenants to buy?

MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member has not quite seen the purport of my reply. If tenants came in in a batch and said, "We want a reduction of 20 per cent.," that may be described as bringing pressure to bear, but it is far better they should come together amicably.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): The right hon. Gentleman says the tenants are protected from aggressive proceedings. Is he aware that in this very district landlords have proceeded against the tenants for the recovery of rents not yet due?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! I would suggest to hon. Members interested in the Answer that they should see the written Answer. It relates to legal matters.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: The right hon. Gentleman has not answered that part of my Question asking "whether a certain landlord having been paid three gales rent is now proceeding for a fourth in the same twelvemonth?

MR. WYNDHAM: I did answer that. I said I have no information, and I have no means of information about the particular facts referred to by the hon. Member.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The Question on the Paper has been answered.

Listellick Farm.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Congested Districts Board have taken any steps to purchase the farm recently put up for sale at Listellick, county Kerry.

MR. WYNDHAM: The question of the purchase of this property will probably be considered by the Board at its next Meeting on the 15th July.

Coleraine—Alleged Police Persecution of a Publican.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the conduct of a police constable named Molloy at Coleraine Petty Sessions in a prosecution against a hotel keeper for breach of the licensing laws; whether he is aware that this constable threatened one of the witnesses that whether he would be summoned or not in future would depend on the way he would give his evidence, and that the case was dismissed; and, if so, will he say whether the constable has been censured for his conduct.

MR. WYNDHAM: The constable used no threat. He stated to one of the witnesses that if he told the truth he might not be summoned. This was an improper observation and the constable has been so informed.

MR. MACVEAGH: Will this constable be removed from the district?

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: Will the right hon. Gentleman take steps to put an end to this systematic persecution of this publican, which has become a matter of public notoriety?

[No answer was returned.]

Irish Veterinary Department—Catholic Official's Salaries.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN: On behalf of the hon. Member for East Mayo, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, whether he can state what substantial advantages have been received by the Catholic officials of the Veterinary Branch of the Agricultural Department in addition to pension rights; whether the new arrangement carries with it any reduction in salaries; whether he is aware that these officials on their present scale of increment would have served thirteen years before receiving salaries of £2 a week, and that the pension after twenty-six years service and upwards would be only 15s. a week; and whether any effort will be made to improve their position.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Question presumably refers to some temporary clerks who were employed at weekly rates of pay before they were placed on the permanent establishment of the Department. In addition to pension rights they obtained the advantage of a more secure position, annual increments of salary, and sick leave privileges on full pay. As temporary clerks they were paid at the rate of 35s. a week, which is equivalent to £91 a year; on promotion they were paid an initial salary of £90. A salary of over £2 a week will be reached after six years established service; had they remained on a temporary footing their remuneration would have continued stationary at 35s. a week. No question of religion enters into Departmental promotions, and the Department is at all times ready to consider the claims of its officers for advancement when opportunity arises.

Wicklow Camp Canteen Licence.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Lord Chancellor of Ireland has considered the action of Mr. James Shanks in signing a licence certificate for a canteen situated in the county Wicklow, Mr. Shanks not being a magistrate for that county, and the local magistrates having refused to grant the licence on the ground that the canteen had been conducted in a disorderly manner; and whether he can now state what decision the Lord Chancellor has come to in regard to Mr. Shanks' action.

Mr. WYNDHAM: No decision has yet been come to. The Lord Chancellor is in correspondence with Mr. Shanks in the matter.

Kerry Parish Committees—Management Rules.

Mr. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will explain why the rules regulating the management of parish committees in Kerry have not been published; whether, under those rules, a district councillor who is a shopkeeper, or resides in a shopkeeper's house, or is a relative of a shopkeeper, is not allowed to act on the committee, and, if so, for what reason; whether he will explain the meaning of the word "shopkeeper" and state what classes of men it includes; whether landlords and their agents to whom the small landowners, for whom the scheme is meant, owe arrears of rent are allowed to be members of the committee; and, if so, will he state what is the cause of this difference of treatment.

Mr. FLAVIN: At the same time may I ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the scheme for parish committees in Kerry is being blocked by the rule debarring district councillors who are shopkeepers from serving on the committees; and whether, in the interest of this scheme, he will at once withdraw this rule.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The rules have been freely supplied to persons locally interested, to members of the committees and to all other persons who have made application for them to the office of the Congested Districts Board. The rule prohibiting a shopkeeper, or a member of his household, from membership of a committee was adopted in the interests of the impartial administration of grants by the committee, the Board being of opinion that persons interested in the sale of materials or goods should not be eligible for membership of a body entrusted with the duty of dealing with applications for grants to enable them to purchase materials or goods. Resident landlords and agents are eligible for membership. They have no direct interest in the sale of materials. The rule in question has hitherto worked satisfactorily and it is not proposed to withdraw it.

Mr. THOMAS O'DONNELL asked if it were the fact that the rules were not followed and if, under the circumstances, the right hon. Gentleman would not withdraw them.

Mr. WYNDHAM replied suggesting that that was unreasonable as the rules were in operation in other parts of Ireland.

Phœnix Park, Dublin.

Mr. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state by whose authority the most convenient parts of the Phœnix Park, Dublin, are railed off and preserved for polo and cricket; and whether, seeing that the Phœnix Park is a public park belonging to the citizens of Dublin, he will explain why the members of Sluagh na Heireann, most of whom are school boys, are prevented from playing native games in the Nine Acres; and whether he will consider the advisability of requiring the members of the polo club to go out to the Fifteen Acres.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The duties and powers of the Commissioners of Public Works in respect to the Phœnix Park are conferred by the Statute 23 and 24 Vict. cap. 42. The park is a Royal park and is the property of the Crown. With respect to the remainder of the Question, the hon. Member's attention does not appear to have been directed to my reply to the similar Question on the 16th instant of the hon. Member for the College Green Division.†

Mr. THOMAS O'DONNELL: Am I to understand from the Answer of the right hon. Gentleman that the Phœnix Park in Dublin is under the control of the Board of Works by statute and is not belonging to the people of Dublin?

Mr. WYNDHAM: I believe that is so. At the same time the citizens in no part of Ireland enjoy so much liberty as those in Dublin.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxvi., 286.

Development of Small Industries in Ireland.

MR. J. F. X. O'BRIEN (Cork): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, with a view to arousing a spirit of enterprise in Ireland, he will consider the desirability of putting before the people such object-lessons as a number of small industries in successful operation in various districts; whether he will consider the best means for organising such small industries through the agency of the Agricultural Department; and whether he will take steps to utilise the acquirements of the children about to be trained in technical schools when fit for work, in order to check emigration.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Department, acting in co-operation with local authorities or associations, has been engaged, for some time past, in conducting experiments of the character indicated. For example, shirt-making at Dundalk and Sligo; straw hat making at Wexford; furniture at Athlone; and hosiery at New Ross, Carlow, and Cavan, Experiments of a similar character at Bandon and Clonmel are at present under consideration.

Enlargement of Kilclooney Burial Ground.

MR. ROCHE (Galway, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state at what price per acre the Congested Districts Board purchased the Kilclooney property, and what sum per acre the Board is asking from the Tuam District Council for the land required to enlarge the Kilclooney burial ground.

MR. WYNDHAM: The average price of the Kilclooney property was £19 per statute acre, but the best land on the estate, such as that to be sold to the Tuam District Council, is estimated to have cost the Board £45 per statute acre.

Blakeney Estate, County Galway.

MR. ROCHE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state if the Blakeney Estate, Abbert, county Galway, is in the Land Judge's Court; if so, for how long; whether he can state the name of the agent or receiver; whether he has been instructed to take advantage of the Land Purchase Act; and whether he will be directed to supply to the tenants any necessary information to enable them to make an offer for the property.

MR. WYNDHAM: The position of this estate is being investigated, and I will ask the hon. Member to postpone the Question till Tuesday next.

Clanricarde Tenants and Sporting Rights.

MR. ROCHE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that five of the Clanricarde tenants at Derrygoolan, Woodford, have been served with notices to quit in consequence of their asserting their right to the game on their lands; and whether he will take steps to ensure that the police shall not be allowed in the future to accompany poachers on the lands, seeing that such proceedings may intimidate the tenants.

MR. WYNDHAM: This is a case in which two parties assert a right to one and the same incorporeal hereditament, *i.e.*, the shooting. It is for them to prove such rights by due course of law. It is for the police to prevent a breach of the peace. The hon. Member describes one of the parties as "poachers," but that involves the decision of the very matter in dispute.

Rae Estate, Keel, County Kerry.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the tenants on the Rae Estate, Keel, county Kerry, have applied to the Congested Districts Board for the purchase of this estate; whether the beneficial owners have signified their consent to sell; whether the Congested Districts Board have made any offer or taken any steps preliminary to an offer.

MR. WYNDHAM: Such an application has been made by the tenants, and the Board is in correspondence with the owners.

Buncrana and Cardonagh Railway.

Mr. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the traffic accounts of the Buncrana to Cardonagh Railway and the Letterkenny to Burtonport Railway have been settled half-yearly, as provided for by the Orders in Council authorising the construction of said lines; if he can say what has been the gross earnings per mile per week in each half-year of said railways; if not, what has been the cause of delay in settling the accounts; whether the accounts, as furnished by the working company to the Treasury or the Board of Works, have been accepted by them as satisfactory; if not, why have steps not been taken to compel the working company to furnish accurate accounts; and whether he can say what is the available surplus in each available for distribution between the Treasury and the working company after providing for the working expenses.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY of the TREASURY (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.): The accounts of the Burtonport Railway are not made up for the half-years ending 31st March and 30th September, but for half yearly periods ending 30th June and 31st December in each year. The line was opened on 9th March, 1903, and the first accounts were made up to the 30th June following. The last accounts were for the half-year ended 31st December. The amounts of the gross earnings per mile per week for the period ended 30th June, and for the half-year ended 31st December were, respectively, £3 18s. and £3 14s. 10d., as shown in the printed accounts furnished by the Lough Swilly Company. The surplus of the gross earnings over and above the amount retained by the Lough Swilly Company for working the line, after payment of dividends on guaranteed shares, is £3,530 for the ten months referred to, but certain items in the accounts are in dispute between the Board of Works and the company. Meantime, pending a settlement, the surplus has not yet been apportioned.

Mr. O'DOHERTY asked a further Question about working expenses, but—

Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH said he could add nothing to his Answer.

Enniskillen Post Office—Missing Postal Orders.

Mr. JORDAN (Fermanagh, S.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he is aware that a letter was posted in Lisnaskea, county Fermanagh, on 23rd April, 1903, by a Mr. McBrien, of Carratistune, Derrylin, addressed to the Earl of Enniskillen, Post Office, Enniskillen, containing four postal orders of 20s. each, numbered $\frac{0}{75}$ 848,480, $\frac{0}{75}$ 848,479, $\frac{6}{76}$ 259,191, and $\frac{6}{76}$ 259,192, and that neither letter nor orders reached their destination; and, if so, will he investigate this affair with a view of ascertaining how the orders were finally disposed of, and will he direct that the amount be refunded by the Department to the sender.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton): Representation was made by Mr. Felix McBrien, of Carratistune, Derrylin, that a letter sent by him on 23rd April, 1903, to the Earl of Enniskillen at the Post Office, Enniskillen, had not been delivered. Search was made, but no trace of any such letter could be found. No postal order for 20s. was issued at the Lisnaskea Post Office on the date in question. The orders quoted were issued there on the 22nd April, and I am satisfied from the inquiries which have been made that they are not the orders which Mr. McBrien states were enclosed in the letter described. In the circumstances there are no grounds on which I should be justified in paying the amount to Mr. McBrien.

Mr. JORDAN: If I furnish the noble Lord with further particulars, with the numbers, and the handwriting of the postmaster, will it influence him to change his mind?

Lord STANLEY: I shall be most happy to look into the question, but I do not say I will change my mind.

Attempted Proselytism in the Cork Post Office.

Mr. J. F. X. O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been called to the fact that on 22nd June the postmaster of Cork permitted Commander Salwey of His Majesty's Coastguards, Kinsale, to visit the interior of the Cork Post Office, the postmaster himself and the telegraph superintendent accompanying him in his tour of the office, and that Commander Salwey distributed religious tracts among the staff on duty; and, if so, whether, in view of the fact that over 90 per cent. of the said staff are Catholics, he will state how the parties guilty of this conduct shall be dealt with.

LORD STANLEY: From the inquiry which has been made, I find that while Captain Salwey was being shown the telegraph office at Cork he apparently dropped tracts on the tables and on the floor unnoticed by the postmaster or the acting superintendent who were accompanying him. The tracts were not, it appears, of a controversial character; and though I think Captain Salwey's conduct was indiscreet, I do not propose to take any action in the matter.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Will the right hon. Gentleman see that this malpractice is not pursued in future, seeing that it is most offensive to a large number of employees?

LORD STANLEY: If it had been discovered in time the officials would certainly have stopped it.

MR. J. F. X. O'BRIEN: Will the right hon. Gentleman inquire as to the distribution of leaflets of this kind, and as to whether it was not done in the company of the postmaster of Cork and the superintendent?

LORD STANLEY: I have said that they were present, but they did not see him dropping the leaflets.

MR. CONDON (Tipperary, E.): They winked the other eye.

Birthday Honours List.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury why, in the official announcement of the list of Birthday honours, has that list been intituled the Prime Minister's List; what is the reason for this new departure in the form of the official announcement, and at whose suggestion and on whose responsibility has it been made; and whether there is any, and, if so, what, precedent for the announcement of the list of Birthday honours as the Prime Minister's List.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): There was no official announcement of the kind suggested by the hon. Gentleman. I understand that the list of honours was headed in one newspaper in the way suggested, but that is not the ordinary way, and certainly it had no authority from me.

Irish Board of Agriculture—Sir Horace Plunkett's Position.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the office of Vice-President of the Irish Board of Agriculture is a Ministerial office, held at the pleasure of the Crown, whose tenure depends on the existence of the Government of which the holder is a member; whether he is aware that the statute constituting the office provides that the person appointed thereto will not, if a Member of the House of Commons, vacate his seat, and will not be required to submit himself for re-election under the provisions of the Place Acts; whether, seeing that it is the duty of the Vice-President of the Agricultural Board to explain and expound in Parliament the policy of that Board, and to answer Parliamentary criticism of that policy on behalf of the Government, that since 1900 the Vice-President of this Board has been without a seat in either House of Parliament, and that the Vice-President himself stated shortly after the general election of 1900 that his absence from Parliament for any considerable time was not compatible with the retention of his office, he will say if there is any, and, if so, what, precedent for the holding by a Minister of the Crown for a period of nearly four years of office without a seat in Parliament; and what action, if any, does he propose to take in this matter.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The first Question is whether the Vice-President of the Irish Board of Agriculture would go out if the Ministry went out. The Answer is in the affirmative. Then the hon. Gentleman asks me whether the seat would be vacated in the ordinary way upon taking office. The answer to that is also in the affirmative. The hon. Gentleman asks me whether there is any precedent for any gentleman who holds Parliamentary office under the Crown not having a seat in this House. Yes, there are many precedents. I am informed that in Mr. Gladstone's and Lord Rosebery's Government of 1892–4 the Attorney-General for Ireland was not in this House, and I have no reason to believe that the life of that Government would have been prolonged if he had been in the House. As regards the quotation from the speech of the Vice-President himself, it is true that he thought, and no doubt thinks, that he could perform his duties better if he were able in this House to deal with the questions that arise in connection with his office. I will be quite frank with the House. When the office was first instituted it was undoubtedly the desire of the Government that the Vice-President should be in this House, and I think it would be more convenient that he should be.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: Why do not you give him a seat?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I cannot state too emphatically that in my opinion the special qualifications of Sir Horace Plunkett for the duties which he carries out—duties which, as I am sure every Member of this House will admit, he has undertaken quite apart from ordinary Party politics—and the single-hearted ability which he has thrown into his duties render his case a special one.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND asked whether, in view of the Prime Minister's high opinion of the services which Sir Horace Plunkett had rendered, and his opinion that he ought to be in that House, the right hon. Gentleman would take steps to have Sir Horace Plunkett selected as the Conservative candidate for one of the vacant seats.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I believe there are parts of the country where the Leader of the Party settles who shall represent a constituency. I have no such desire.

The Licensing Bill.

Mr. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): I desire to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, having regard not only to the inconvenience of short notice, but also to the fact that on all previous occasions when propositions of the kind which the right hon. Gentleman is to make to-morrow have been made longer notice has been given, he seriously proposes to take the notice standing in his name to-morrow.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes, Sir, I quite seriously propose it. I do not exactly understand what the right hon. Gentleman's objection is. Of course, if there are difficulties in the way of his marshalling his forces in order to deal with the question, I should sympathise with him. But it is certainly not a question in regard to which elaborate considerations have to be worked out, or on which hon. Gentlemen require time to prepare their speeches.

Mr. BRYCE: As I am challenged on the subject I will tell the right hon. Gentleman why we think longer notice is necessary. It is because we look upon this occasion as one of the utmost gravity and because many Members of the House who have business engagements made long ago will find it very difficult to be present to-morrow. Among them is the Leader of the Opposition, who is absent at this moment. I ask the right hon. Gentleman, considering that the interests of the country and of this House must necessarily be involved in this matter, whether it would not be in accordance with his sense of due respect to the House of Commons to give longer notice.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I think the right hon. Gentleman is labouring under a mistake. I have not refreshed my memory with the degree of notice given with regard to the Home Rule Bill, the Evicted Tenants Bill, the Education Bill, or the other Bills to which this process has been applied; but I certainly do not see why the interval which I have given between yesterday and to-morrow is not sufficient to enable hon. Members to make up their minds on the subject.

Mr. BRYCE: The right hon. Gentleman did not give notice yesterday. The notice only came to the knowledge of Members of the House this morning when the Papers were delivered. With regard to the Education Bill, the right hon. Gentleman gave notice at the end of a Friday sitting and did not take the Motion until the following Tuesday.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Can the right hon. Gentleman also refresh my memory with regard to the Evicted Tenants Bill?

MR. BRYCE: My recollection is that considerable notice was given.

NEW BILLS.

VALUATION (No. 2) BILL.

"To amend the Law to enable the council of every county and county borough to be the sole Valuation Authority of its county or borough for all rateable purposes, and for Income-Tax and Inhabited House Duty," presented by Mr. John Hutton; supported by Sir John Dorington and Colonel Stopford Sackville; to be read a second time upon Monday, 18th July, and to be printed. [Bill 249.]

DRUNKENNESS (IRELAND) BILL.

"To amend the Law relating to Drunkenness in Ireland, and for purposes connected therewith," presented by Mr. Hugh Law; supported by Sir James Haslett, Sir Thomas Esmonde, Mr. T. W. Russell, and Captain Donelan; to be read a second time upon Wednesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 250.]

SUPPLY [14TH APRIL] [15TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Resolution reported.

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1904-5.

"That a sum, not exceeding £2,839,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge for the Supply and Repair of Warlike and other Stores, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905."

Resolution read a second time.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) moved to reduce the sum by £10,000 in respect of artillery. The re-armament of the artillery with quick-firing guns was a matter which had been already discussed this session. A very large sum of money would be required for the re-armament, of which none was asked for in the present year, and one complaint was that the whole of the cost of the present year was being thrown on the Indian Estimates. It appeared that the Government were now retubing the existing guns and the amount by which he asked that the Vote should be reduced was the minimum cost of the process. The Vote in the Estimates for guns and carriages this year showed a reduction of £500,000 and that for field artillery had also been considerably reduced. This country was to pay a certain proportion of the cost of re-armament next year, but it appeared that the heaviest portion of the cost was to be thrown on the Estimates two years hence. Looking to the fact that this re-armament had been expected for many years, that it had been most actively demanded by the House since 1899, that it had been far too long postponed, and that credit had been taken by the Prime Minister for a re-armament which never, as a fact, took place, it did seem monstrous that the main charge for the re-armament of the artillery should be thrown on the Army Estimates two years hence. It was a most improper proceeding. He noted also that the question of supplying field guns to the Volunteer and Militia artillery was untouched. It had been constantly pointed out to the House that we were behind other Powers in the matter of re-armament of the artillery with quick-firing guns. In the present war between Russia and Japan quick-firing guns had played a most important part, and it had been clearly demonstrated that any army which took the field with guns such as we now had would be lost. Although they were told the manufacturers were to have carte blanche, yet the guns would not be ready for two years. Both Japan and Russia, however, had turned them out with much greater speed, and it seemed to him incredible that this country could not do as well. The sum he moved was intended to cover a large proportion of the cost of the retubing which was going on in this country, which was an attempt to make fit for service guns which were altogether superannuated—guns which no other Power in the world would put into the field.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the sum of '£2,839,000,' and to insert the sum of '£2,829,000.'"—(*Sir Charles Dilke.*)

Question proposed, "That '£2,839,000' stand part of the said Resolution."

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.) said he was quite unable to understand the grave nature of the right hon. Gentleman's charge in regard to the expenditure on new guns. It was perfectly true that it was decided by him, in consultation with his right hon. friend the Secretary of State for India, that the expenditure on the new guns this year should, in the main, fall upon India. What was there to criticise in that arrangement? They could only manufacture during the first year a certain number of guns, and where were those guns more likely to be wanted than in India? He had ascertained the output capacity of the firms engaged in the manufacture of guns, and had also taken into account the amount of money available for the purchase of the guns in the current year. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to think that the British Army was in some way worse off because the first guns were to go to India.

SIR CHARLES DILKE said his point that day was that they had put off the main supply until two years hence.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said they had now sealed the patterns of the horse and field guns, and they had ascertained the number which could be manufactured during the current year; that would amount to twenty-one horse and field batteries. A very considerable amount of work, to the extent of over £100,000, which would contribute towards the completion of the guns in the next year to be appropriated to the Army at home, would also be done. He could not agree with the right hon. Gentleman that they had put off the bulk of the expenditure on these guns till 1907. The right hon. Gentleman had suggested that in other countries the guns were manufactured with greater speed. He had taken great pains to ascertain what had been the exact process of re-armament in every other country which had re-armed, and he did not find that, in proportion to the Army they had to supply, we were acting in any way differently from any other country. They were proposing, and he hoped they would be able, to spend £1,300,000 on these guns during next year. They believed that the rate of manufacture would enable them to turn out a battery a week. He did not regard that as a low rate of manufacture, though he believed that, if they abandoned all their other work, and concentrated entirely on the manufacture of guns, it would be possible to slightly accelerate the out-put. But the question of how they should apportion their work was one which the responsible Department must be allowed to deal with. If they manufactured at the rate of a battery a week during next year, he thought they would be doing a great deal towards accomplishing the end they had in view. Even in the current year the manufacture of the component parts of the guns would be proceeded with. He did not know if the right hon. Gentleman was aware of what an elaborate process preceded the actual manufacture of guns. After the sealed pattern had been received, patterns had to be made not only for the Royal Gun Factories but also for private manufacturers. He was anxious that the guns manufactured this year should proceed as fast as they could, but he did not for a moment anticipate that they would to any extent be in advance of the estimate they had formed. They had made a very strenuous effort to do their duty in this matter. They were arranging for the re-armament of the whole of the horse and field artillery of this country, and the limit of time was far shorter than had ever been the case for such a purpose in the history of the country. He could conceive that a national emergency might arise which would make it desirable that we should be armed more quickly, and perhaps in that event progress might be accelerated. If the right hon. Member for the Forest of Dean could get his

Party, who had been greatly in favour of a reduction of our military expenditure, to allow him to expend during the coming year more than £1,300,000, he should certainly thank him for the assistance he had given and would expend the money. He would remind hon. Members how this money had been found in other countries; in France, he believed, the money for re-arming the artillery was found almost exclusively from the sale of the fortifications of Paris. Well, London was not a fortified city and we had not got the happy opportunity of selling our fortifications and turning them into guns; the money in our case had to come solidly out of the Army Estimates. They were doing all that could reasonably be undertaken in the present year, and in future years they were contemplating the performance of as much as the House would allow.

With regard to another matter raised by the right hon. Gentleman, the armament of the Volunteer field artillery batteries with the new gun, there was, of course, a great divergence of opinion as to the desirability of furnishing the Auxiliary Forces with field guns. The right hon. Gentleman and he were rather in agreement on this matter, that we should utilise a portion of our Auxiliary Forces in the manipulation of the field gun. But he was bound to say that that was not the prevailing military opinion, and he thought it was not altogether unreasonable, as they had to curtail their expenditure as much as they could, not to expand too rapidly in the direction of adding to the Militia and Volunteer artillery. Already a partial experiment, however, had been made. A Volunteer heavy battery had been given the opportunity of using the field gun, and it was a perfectly fair question to ask whether they could develop this dedication of field guns to the Auxiliary Forces. But he would remind the House, at the same time, that we were in a much better position with regard to the artillery than we had ever been in before. We had actually doubled in the last few years the number of horse and field batteries, and if it should become necessary to diminish, rather than to increase, the number of the available infantry in this country, we should come much nearer to the European computation of the proportion between the field guns and the infantry which the right hon. Gentleman opposite desired we should attain. He would ask the right hon. Gentleman not to accept from him the view that this was a closed question; he did not think it was; he thought they would yet have to consider the question of how far they should entrust the field gun to the Auxiliary Forces.

*SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth) said the right hon. Gentleman had spoken of turning out the new guns this year. He would like to ask him whether, when speaking of this year, he meant the financial year.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said the financial year. They hoped in the current financial year to manufacture twenty-one batteries, and to prepare for the completion of a number of additional batteries in the next year.

*SIR JOHN COLOMB: Can you give an approximate date when you will be in a position to begin turning them out?

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said he supposed it would be towards the end of this year, when the manufacturing firms and the Ordnance Factories would be in possession of the necessary plant and machinery. Obviously the manufacturers would not be in full swing until they had been carrying on the business for some time.

*SIR JOHN COLOMB feared there was a lack of perspective in what was proposed. He conceived it was the duty of the House to grant the Government all the money necessary, whatever the amount, to enable it to proceed with all reasonable expedition with the re-armament of the artillery, and he hoped that nothing would induce the Government to cut down a single shilling of the expenditure that was necessary for the purpose. So far as the Volunteer and Militia artillery was concerned he was not in agreement with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Forest of Dean. He did not believe in supplying the Auxiliary Forces with field guns if they were only liable to serve in the United Kingdom.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central) joined with the hon. and gallant Member for Great Yarmouth in insisting on the importance of proceeding rapidly with the re-armament of the artillery. He said the lesson, as far as they could gather it, of the war between Russia and Japan was that the superiority of the Japanese artillery had been the determining factor in every engagement. It would be false economy not to provide the very best weapon that could be got, and neglect of that duty meant serious danger to the country. It might be expensive, for guns soon got out of date, but still we were bound to supply our forces in the field with the best available armaments. As to the arming of the Volunteers with artillery, it was scandalous that that question should have been put off time after time. He wanted to point out the importance of supplying field guns to the Volunteer artillery.

COLONEL LEGGE (St. George's, Hanover Square) said that the right hon. Baronet the Member for Forest of Dean had made a charge against the War Office in connection with the delay in arming the artillery with new quick-firing guns. The Memorandum presented to the House at the commencement of the session by the Secretary of State for War set forth that the manufacture of the quick-firing guns and equipment was about to commence. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War now told the House that the manufacture of these guns had commenced and would be completed in three years time. That was exactly the time mentioned by his right hon. friend which it took the Japanese Government to reconstruct their artillery armaments; and if, at the end of three years, our artillery was as good and as well served as that of the Japanese, he did not think we would have much cause to complain. He wished to draw attention to the question of the lance——

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said that he had only spoken specifically in respect of Item B.

*MR. SPEAKER said that it would be more convenient if the hon. and gallant Member were to make his observations on the main question rather than on this particular Amendment.

*MR. J. F. HOPE (Sheffield, Brightside) said he sympathised greatly with the object of the right hon. Baronet the Member for Forest of Dean in proposing this reduction; because, on the face of it, he did not see why the manufacture of the whole of the artillery should not have been taken in hand at once, at any cost. They were, of course, cribbed, cabined, and confined in this matter by financial necessities, because they, too, had to draw their finances from a limited number of sources of taxation. He did not wish to go further into the question; but he wanted to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office exactly how the matter stood in regard to the orders for these guns. He thought that the hon. Gentleman, in answer to a Question put some time ago, stated that the orders for guns for the Indian Army would be given out as quickly as possible, and that they would be allocated in the proportion of two-thirds to the trade, and one-third to the Government arsenals. Had the orders been given out in these proportions? The private firms had two claims on the Government; first, because they had been specifically asked in former times to increase their means of production. But these means of production could not be made available in times of stress unless they were employed in times of peace. A distinct and plain pledge was given in that regard by the present Chief Secretary for Ireland, by the Secretary for India, and confirmed by the now Secretary of State for War. It had recently been the fashion to talk of the distress caused by the dismissal of Government servants at the Government arsenals, but there were other places in the kingdom, such as Sheffield, where there had been no less distress on account of the lack of Government orders.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT, Cheshire, Macclesfield) said that the right hon. Member had asked for some specific information as to the manufacture of quick-firing guns. He said that the manufacture of the whole of these guns should be taken in hand at once without reference to cost. The hon. Gentleman below the gangway said that the right policy was for the Government to come to Parliament and ask for any money needful to provide the guns necessary for the service of the Army with all reasonable expedition.

*MR. J. F. HOPE said that what he had stated was that that was an ideal policy.

MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT said he quite agreed, everybody agreed, and he hoped the House of Commons would agree, that whatever it might be necessary for the War Office to ask the House for this purpose should be given. We should see, however, how that would be next year. He did not quite understand the object of the question raised by the right hon. Baronet the Member for Forest of Dean. The right hon. Baronet talked about throwing the expenditure on the year after next.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said that he based himself on the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War on the Estimates, and on the answer to a Question that day when he asked the right hon. Gentlemen to specify what was the amount of the charge in the next financial year and in the year after that, because the armament was announced to be completed by the 31st March, 1907.

MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT said that during the present year, 1904–5, no batteries were to be made for this country. The batteries to be made this year were to be made for India. Next year the batteries were to be made for home, and the year after that, 1906–7, under present arrangements the whole programme would be completed.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said that what he had asserted was that the bulk of the money would be spent in the year after next.

MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT said the fact was that practically one-half of it would be spent next year, and there was an extra £550,000 which would be spent the year after next. He thought it was hardly fair, in respect of a total expenditure of between £3,000,000 and £4,000,000, to say that the bulk of the expenditure had been put on the year after next.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said that the bulk of the expenditure in the year after next would fall on this country.

MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT said that as a matter of fact next year the expenditure would be £1,300,000, and beyond that there would be an extra sum of £550,000 although the guns would not have been completed and the year after there would also be an expenditure of £1,300,000. That was the programme at the present time, and he did not think it was quite accurate to say that the bulk of the money would be spent in the year after next or that there was any deliberate attempt on the part of the Government to postpone asking for what money was necessary to arm the artillery. His hon. friend the Member for Brightside had raised a very interesting and difficult question, which, however, he thought it would be rather inconvenient to discuss at the present moment. What he could say was that the allocation of the orders for guns would be made according to accepted principles, which were, as he had said, that the trade reserves should be taken advantage of as well as the reserves of the Government factories. But he thought that his hon. friend rather overstated the case when he said that the private firms had a claim on the Government. It was true that the Government had encouraged these firms to lay out very large sums of money in the provision of plant and machinery as a reserve power of supply of armaments. The Government had regarded the existence of that plant and machinery as a reserve power of supply and that, unless that power of supply were there, it would be absolutely necessary for the Government to provide that reserve power of supply. In other words, the reserve at present existing in the plant and machinery at Woolwich would have to be very much larger.

Mr. J. F. HOPE asked if any orders had yet been given out to private firms.

Mr. BROMLEY DAVENPORT said that no orders had yet been given.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 213; Noes, 151. (Division List No. 185.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Colomb, Rt. Hon Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Gordon, Maj Evans- (T'r H'mlets
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E. W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hain, Edward
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R. (Dulwich
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helder, Augustus
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Horner, Frederick William
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kimber, Henry
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks. N. R
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Lowe, Francis William
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E. (Wigt'n
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir Frederick G.
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh, N.)
Mitchell, William (Burnley)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir Harry S. (Limehouse
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tollemache, Henry James

Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tuffnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col.SirC.E H(Sheffield
Walrond,Rt.Hn. Sir WilliamH.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby,Lt.-Col.A.C.E.(Taunton
Whiteley,H.(Ashton und. Lyne
Wills, Sir Frederick
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H.(Yorks.
Wodehouse,Lt.Hn.E.R. (Bath)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley,Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William(Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh,S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin,CharlesRamsay(Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny N.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Elibank, Master of
Ellice,Capt.EC(S.Andrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Farrell, James Patrick
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Harcourt, Lewis V.(Rossendale
Harcourt,RtHnSirW(Monm'th
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson,Dr. Charles Fredk.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy,Vincent P.(Cavan,W.
Kilbride, Denis
Labouchere, Henry
Law,Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Hugh, Patrick
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Mooney, John J.
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James, F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow,W.
O'Doherty, William
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon,N
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rigg, Richard
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely, Maj.J.E.B.(Isleof Wight
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Wason, Jn. Cathcart (Orkney)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Chas. Henry(Hull, N.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, SirJ.T(Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Warner and Capt. Norton.

COLONEL LEGGE said he would again urge on the Secretary of State for War not to lose sight of the question of lances and pistols for the cavalry. They were abolished without due consideration; and he hoped the question would be reconsidered. All European cavalry had retained the lance. It was stated in the Press that the Russian Lancers had recently overwhelmed the Japanese cavalry; and that was about the only success which the Russians had achieved during the present war. He hoped his right hon. friend would give the matter his best consideration.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) said he wished to ask a question as to the financial aspect of the manner in which the War Office conducted its business. At present, the infantry and cavalry were being re-armed with new rifles; and he should like to know the ratio, not only in money but also in rifles, between the Government factories and private contractors. It had been stated that rifles could be produced at the Government arsenals at about £3 a piece, whereas private firms charged £4. It had been suggested that interest on buildings and capital and depreciation should be taken into consideration. The one item not allowed for was the cost of the land on which the factory stood, but as that would not have been very expensive at the time the factory was built a penny per rifle would probably more than cover it, so that that would not account for the difference. It was said to be necessary that private factories should be kept going in order that in time of war there should be room for expansion in the supply. But that argument cut both ways. The larger the Small Arms Factory, the easier it would be to increase it. The Government factory would be able much more easily than a private firm to increase its machinery. It would be all very well to keep outside firms going if they produced the rifles at anything like the cost in the Government factories; but the paying of 25 per cent. more should be deferred until the emergency arose, especially as a great deal of distress at present existed in consequence of the shortage of work at the Small Arms Factory. He regarded it as a monstrous piece of War Office mismanagement that this waste of money should go on. Every possible economy in War Office administration ought to be effected, but if millions of money were to be wasted in this fashion there would be no hope of securing an efficient Army at a smaller cost. The efficiency of the Army depended upon the artillery more than anything else, but our guns fired only one shot to the foreigner's three, so that in the event of war we should be at a terrible disadvantage in the one arm upon which every victory in the present struggle in the East had depended.

*SIR JOHN COLOMB desired to repeat his protest against the placing on the Army Estimates of the charge for submarine mines and Brennan torpedoes. The capital expenditure on the Brennan torpedo, which was introduced ten or twelve years ago, had been nearly half a million of money; it had cost something like £32,000 a year, and the charge under this particular item was £12,500. For submarine mines a sum of £61,000 was asked for. He protested altogether against these methods of defence being charged on the Army Estimates. Looking at the question broadly, ought we not to learn a lesson from the present position of Port Arthur with regard to submarine mines? He did not want to run the risk of having mines loose at the mouth of the Thames. He objected to the policy altogether. The maritime defence of this country would have to be active; it could not be passive, nor could it be handed over to the Army. He did not ask the Secretary of State to make any statement on the subject, he simply desired to repeat the protest he had often made. A big principle was involved, and in the new Army scheme, which he hoped would be carefully considered before it was produced, attention would have to be paid to the question of how far it was right to devote money voted for Army purposes to these aquatic arrangements, which he believed to be altogether bad in principle and absolutely in the wrong hands.

*CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.) said the present Secretary of State for War was exonerated to some extent from the blame for the gross mismanagement which had taken place in connection with the supplying of the Army with a suitable rifle. On March 7th it was stated that a new rifle had been in course of manufacture for some time; therefore the Government had had ample time to deal with the question in a manner other than that they had adopted. The fact that £700,000 was to fall on the finances of India went to show that much of the expenditure which ought really to be borne upon the Votes this year was being cast forward to subsequent years. The rifle with which we fought the South African War, the old Lee-Enfield, was defective in sighting. That defect was well known to the manufacturers, but the rifles went through the ordinary inspection, and it was nobody's duty to call the attention of the Government to the fact that we had rifles with defective sights. The effect of that was that thousands of men sacrificed their lives in South Africa because they had not a weapon that would shoot, and the widows of these men were now endeavouring to keep their children out of the workhouse. He contended that if there had been effective inspection those lives would not have been sacrificed. The guilt of this lay at the door of the Government, of which the right hon. Gentleman was a member. But what were the Government doing now? The cost of the Lee-Enfield was about 52s., yet the Government were throwing away the country's money by tinkering up these rifles and issuing them to the troops as converted weapons. They required in the first place new barrels and new sights, a new charger to simplify the drop of the cartridge into the magazine, and the extension of the magazine to such an extent as to hold ten cartridges. Then the body required to be altered and the stock; and although these stocks had been knocked about in the South African War, and in some cases had had pieces of wood let in, these weapons were to be issued as converted to the troops. The original cost was only 52s. and this, as he understood, was a matter of economy. What he wanted to know was how much this conversion was going to cost, because his contention was that these rifles were not worth converting.

If the Government were guilty of wasting public money with regard to the conversion of these old rifles, they were much more so in connection with the new rifle, because what took place with regard to the new rifle was that, although they had been in the course of construction for some time, at the present moment there were not more than 15,000 or 16,000 in existence. Owing to its terrible defects it was most unreliable. One of the great defects of the new rifle was its terrible recoil, which was so great that he had seen large numbers of men afraid to shoot with it. To obviate the recoil the Government had had the barrels enlarged at the muzzle with the result that no shooting power could be got out of it. The shooting had become irregular. If India was to be supplied with seventy-one thousand stands of arms, there ought to be 60,000 of these rifles now ready, but owing to the initial mistakes and the consequent experiments there were only 15,000 or 16,000. The right hon. Gentleman was, of course, anxious to give a fair share of this work to private firms, but he ventured to assert that if those firms followed the specifications given to them the result would be the production of a rifle which would not shoot. The result of all the investigations that had taken place was that they had come back to the old parallel barrel with progression in the rifling only. If he were asked how this should be obviated and how the viewing should be done, his answer would be that the manufacturers should be made responsible for the barrel and that the viewing should be done by their foremen who were competent for the work. But what was the position with regard to the Small Arms Factories at Enfield? There they had some 2,500 men who had been experimenting for more than a year and no rifles had been issued, and if the House took into consideration the high pay these men got, the cost of these rifles came out not at £4 but at £15 or £16 each.

Then, with regard to the machine guns, he would like to know how many Maxims, how many Nordenfeldts, and how many Gardiner guns we had, and what each gun cost the country when obtained from the manufacturers as against what they cost when manufactured in our Small Arms Factories. He would also like to know what orders had been given for these various guns and to whom they had been given, because his contention was that the country's money had been wasted, first by experimental processes, and secondly by an unfair proportion of orders being given to private firms. At the present time the Small Arms Factory at Enfield was doing one-third of the work it usually did, and he contended the orders should not be given out until the Government factories were working at higher pressure. What had occurred? During the war the Enfield factory was only working at an average of ten hours a day whilst private firms were working three eight-hour shifts. It was clear, therefore, that at that time advantage was not taken of the Government arsenals. In some departments of the Enfield factory there was from 50 to 70 per cent. of the plant lying idle whilst large orders were going to Birmingham and other places; not that he had any objection to orders going anywhere, but he had a special interest in seeing that the Government factories did their fair share of work. He disclaimed any intention to cast any slur on the heads of the factory at Enfield, who always did their best, but it was not, in his opinion, possible for any official to carry out the work satisfactorily if he were compelled to keep an experienced staff at a high price which he could not utilise. In this year, when we were not at war, they were turning out at Enfield only half the work which they turned out in the years when the Lee-Enfield was being manufactured. They had heard recently a great deal about the importance of artillery fire. What won battles was not artillery but rifle fire, and this was of the greatest importance in the class of country in which the British Army was usually called upon to operate. Notwithstanding this they found the Government shirking their duty by not turning out the maximum number of rifles at Enfield and elsewhere, and they were not arming our force with the best weapon that could be produced.

*MR. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow) said that some people held that it did not matter much whether the rifle was very accurate or not, but that was not his opinion. He thought if the new rifle did not shoot accurately it would be a great pity to have a large number made before the rifle had been thoroughly tested. The great idea of the War Office nowadays of teaching recruits to shoot appeared to be to keep them snapping at their inspector's eye. Probably the recruits got bored by this process. It struck him that if they wanted to teach men to shoot they should begin early and shoot with miniature rifles, if not, even an air-gun was better than the snapping business. He hoped that before this question was finally settled the rifle would be thoroughly tested by the Auxiliary as well as the Regular Forces, because, if, as reported, the rifle kicked considerably, it would be a fatal objection to its use, especially by the Auxiliary Forces. They had now brought the sights nearer together and consequently shooting had been rendered more difficult. He did not think that there was the slightest advantage in having the rifle shortened for infantry and mounted infantry, and in his opinion a long rifle was much easier to shoot with than a short one.

MAJOR SEELY (Isle of Wight) urged the Secretary for War to pause before proceeding with the manufacture of the new rifle. It was getting more and more difficult in this country to obtain suitable practice with the rifle owing to the crowded nature of these islands, and they had been obliged to shoot with reduced charges both in the Regular Army, the Auxiliaries, and in the rifle clubs as a means of getting out of the difficulty. All this shooting was of great and substantial value so long as the difference between firing with reduced ammunition and a full charge was very slight. If they had a new rifle in which the recoil was greater the value of this kind of shooting practice would be enormously reduced. He took a deep interest in rifle clubs and he was loth to see a weapon adopted which would render the practice now being carried out in his part of the country of less value than it was at the present time, and he urged the right hon. Gentleman to consider whether it would not be advisable to see that the new rifle should have as little recoil as possible. It might be that the new model would give a less recoil, and if he could be assured on that point it would be a great relief not only to himself but also to all those who took an interest in amateur rifle shooting.

His principal reason for rising was to call attention to the extraordinary position in which the nation stood in regard to the re-arming of the artillery. It was perfectly true that battles were won to a great extent by the rifle, but it was no less true that they were also won to a great extent by artillery; and although it was a matter of controversy as to whether the new rifle or the old one was the best, there was no doubt the artillery of the British Army was the worst used by any civilised nation of any importance in the world. The position was so extraordinary that he ventured to ask the House to consider it. If they were asked to name the greatest military curiosity the reply would be that the richest nation in the world had the worst artillery. The difference between the artillery this country possessed and that possessed by the great countries with whom they might possibly be at war was not a difference of degree but of kind. There was a great difference in the velocity of the shot, in the first place; in the second place there was a difference in the fact that the ammunition was fixed in one piece; and thirdly, there was the difference that recoil in the new gun was worked by a mechanical arrangement on the carriage. The consequence was that whereas the old gun with which our Army was armed—with the solitary exception of a few batteries—could only fire from one to two shots per minute, the gun which they might have had and which had been adopted by other countries fired between twelve and eighteen shots per minute. The Financial Secretary knew from his own experience in the field of war how fatal it was to be possessed of a gun of which a battery was of less value than one gun possessed by the enemy. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would give them a more satisfactory assurance upon this subject than he had given up to the present as to what efforts were being made to remedy this extraordinary state of affairs. On the 7th of March they were assured that the gun had been chosen, that it had been tested, and that it had shown results of a startling nature. All the artillery experts and others who saw the trials, they were informed, were wholly and entirely convinced that the danger they ran in not adopting this quick-firing gun was very great. On the 7th March they were told that the manufacture of this gun would begin within a month of that date. Some three and a half months had since elapsed, and not only had the manufacture of this gun not commenced but no orders for it had been given. No doubt the right hon. Gentleman was determined that they must have a good gun, but they had been stopped by considerations of economy so misplaced as to be absolutely deplorable. He was perfectly certain that if the right hon. Gentleman could say that the matter would receive immediate attention, and would ask the Opposition to permit a sum to be voted to re-arm the Army in this country and in India with a quick-firing gun, the Government would receive the unanimous consent of the House and the country. The men in the artillery felt the inferiority in which this wealthy country was placed in this respect. In South Africa our Army was in the strange position of being, not only out-ranged, but outnumbered owing to the enemy possessing quick-firing guns. They were told the other day that the Gatling guns out-ranged our own. They were told also tha the guns used by the Boers in South Africa, and those used by the Chinese out-ranged our own. He submitted that the country and the Army did not wish to be any longer trifled with in this matter. They were assured that the re-armament of the Army would be commenced when the gun was chosen. The gun was chosen ten months ago and no order had yet been given. The gun was tried, and the late Commander-in-Chief decided that no substantial improvement could be made.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said he saw this gun only a few weeks ago. It had only then been decided which of the competing guns should be adopted. The delay was due to the further investigation of the merits of the weapons by the committee who had been dealing with it.

MAJOR SEELY said he knew that no blame attached to the right hon. Gentleman, but the fact was that whereas this gun was decided upon, in substance, ten months ago, constant delay, had occurred in regard to the matter of breech arrangements. The matter had been delayed and delayed, and he challenged denial when he said that the real reason for this had been that £3.250,000 was an inconvenient sum to spend. He knew that was not the view o the Secretary of State for War. It had been the view in the past, and he thought both sides of the House were with him when he asked that an absolute assurance should be given that this vital matter would be no longer delayed.

SIR A. HAYTER (Walsall) said he wished to ask the Financial Secretary one or two Questions. On page 61 of the Estimates, Vote 9, under heading "G. Equipment Stores," harness and saddlery for 1904–5 showed a decrease of £37,000, accoutrements a decrease of £90,000, and transport vehicles a decrease of £75,000, as compared with the amounts in the preceding year. Was there such a surplus of these articles at the close of the war as to warrant these reductions, or was it the intention to permanently diminish the quantities kept in store? The Public Accounts Committee had before them evidence that there was a great lack of saddles during the latter part of the war. The saddles sent out for the Yeomanry were described as unfit for any man to sit on, and others were bought up on the veldt almost, or anywhere in South Africa. The saddles which were sold had fetched almost ridiculous prices. He assumed from the amount of the appropriation-in-aid, which was very little different from that of last year, that the sales of stores in South Africa were very nearly concluded. That made him all the more anxious to know what was the cause of the diminutions in the amounts taken this year for the stores to which he had referred.

*COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.) said he was astonished that the Secretary of State for War had denied that the new rifle had more recoil than the old one. It was the "kick" that the men felt, and many a man would not shoot, if he could possibly avoid doing so, on account of the "kick." It seemed to him to be a physical impossibility not to increase the recoil of the rifle if, with a lighter barrel, the same class of powder were used. He wished to have an explanation of that. The new rifle might even be very much worse in some respects than the old one. His experience had been that weapons were very nearly always enhanced in value as the length of the barrel was increased. There was greater distance between the sights of the weapon, and, therefore, it was easier to aim. On the other hand, when the length of the barrel was decreased that advantage was correspondingly lessened. The figures which had lately been published on the subject were against the theory of the Secretary of State for War that the "kick" was not greater. He believed that what had been done was to put six or eight years modern improvements into the new rifle, but they might make away with these improvements by taking five inches off the length of the rifle. The latest model of any rifle ought to be the best, but that did not always happen, because sometimes people were foolish. In this case it was possible that the shortening of the rifle might do away with the good effects of the improvements. Lord Roberts was entitled to his opinion, but for his own part he would sooner have the opinion of people who had experimented with the weapon than the opinion of the greatest general, even that of Napoleon or Wellington, as to the class of arms best suited for the service. He had the greatest distrust of the shortening of the rifle. It seemed to him a very extraordinary thing if the War Department was without the best type of quick-firing artillery. It was, however, a very hard thing to get. He differed from the hon. Member for the Isle of Wight, who said that quick-firing depended partly on loading and partly on the recoil. The loading had very little to do with it. Any gun could be loaded quickly. It was entirely a question of checking the recoil. It was no use spending all this money if they were not to get a really good rifle. He thought that 5,000 of the new rifles should be distributed not only in the Army, but among the Militia and Volunteers, so that the weapon could be thoroughly tested by impartial men.

COLONEL BLUNDELL (Lancashire, Ince) said that as to the length of the barrel, when he was in the Rifle Brigade they were always told that the rifle with a long barrel was the best for aiming at long distances. He hoped the Secretary of State for War would not sacrifice efficiency in the new weapon in order to get a rifle which was convenient to be carried on horseback by cavalry and mounted infantry.

MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT said, in regard to the Question put by the right hon. Member for Walsall, that there was no intention permanently to reduce the equipment stores. Hon. Gentlemen had drawn attention to the new guns and the new rifles. He was not qualified to speak of the new guns, but he thought that everybody admitted that there was a deficiency in the quick-firing guns.

MAJOR SEELY: The only deficiency in the new guns is that they are not there.

MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT said that with reference to the new rifle, it must at once be admitted that the shortening of the barrel would probably increase the recoil. But he did not think that ought to cover the whole question, because it was equally obvious that there were compensating advantages, such as the lightness and handiness of the rifle. Experiments had been made in shooting, and in another place the figures had been given. At 500 yards the long rifle—*i.e.*, the old rifle, beat the short rifle by ·05 per foot; at 600 yards the short rifle beat the long by ·09 per foot; at 1,000 yards the long rifle beat the short by ·17 per foot; at 1,500 yards the short rifle beat the long by ·68 per foot; and at 1,700 yards the short rifle beat the long by ·09 per foot. The firing was from the shoulder. He would put it no higher than this, that the shooting of the rifles appeared to be equal, and when to that was added the compensating advantages of the short rifle, he thought there was no doubt that the new rifle would be a very great improvement. The cost of the conversion of the old rifle was £2 5s. the cost of the new rifle being £3 10s. and the converted rifle was not inferior to the new rifle.

A question of principle had been raised in regard to the employment of the trade for the manufacture of rifles. It seemed that that was alleged sometimes as a labour, and sometimes as an economical, grievance. It was not a labour grievance at all, however, for it did not make the slightest difference to the body of British working men whether the wages paid for work done were paid in Enfield, Sheffield, Newcastle, or elsewhere. It made a difference, of course, to the workmen at Woolwich or Enfield; that, however, was not a labour grievance but a local grievance. Trouble had befallen that particular branch of labour with the reduction of employment that came at the end of the great inflation which prevailed during the South African War. It was not only at Enfield that there had been distress. He was told that at the present time there were 10,000 men fewer employed upon Government work in private firms than during the war. It was fair that these facts should be considered, when it was suggested that an injustice had been done to the locality at Enfield or at Woolwich, because the Government had pursued a policy not of its own creation, but approved by its predecessors for many years past. It was not the case that in regard to rifles an undue proportion of the work had been given to private firms; on the contrary, the general principle had been departed from in favour of the factories. He was convinced that it was right and proper as a general principle that the Government should make use of private establishments which had spent large sums in laying down plant and machinery in reserve for emergencies and crises whenever they might arise. If the Government plant was to be kept fully employed by taking away from the trade their proportion of the work, then private firms would certainly reduce their plant to the level of their own requirements. But there must be a reserve, and in that case the Government would be forced to have an enormously increased reserve at Enfield and at Woolwich. He was not in a position to say exactly what proportion of rifles were given to private firms and what proportion were made in Government factories, but he thought it was about half and half. He had figures which showed that there had been a great reduction in the number of men engaged on Government work by private firms. One firm which employed 4,602 men on Government work during the war now only employed 3,209; another firm which had been employing 1,400 men now only employed 700; in a third there was a decrease from 2,700 men to 400 men. He had expressly indicated that this question could not be confined to rifles only. It was a question of policy and principle. Altogether, he was informed that 10,000 fewer men were now engaged in Government work than were employed during the war. It was fair that the fact should be considered when hon. Members suggested that an injustice was being done to certain localities because the Government had pursued a policy which had been approved by their predecessors.

CAPTAIN NORTON said he accepted the policy as a whole; but, in his opinion, an undue proportion of rifle work had been given to private contractors.

MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT said he was glad to know that the hon. Gentleman accepted the policy. The reduction of the men employed by private firms in Government work showed that the general principle had not been departed from. He was laying down a general principle, which he was convinced was sound, namely, that it was right and proper that the Government should make use of private contractors who had laid out very large sums in providing plant and machinery in order that they might be a reserve in periods of crises. It was suggested that it was an injustice to the localities that the Government should keep plant and machinery lying idle, while they gave orders to private firms. Let him press that contention to its logical conclusion. If the Government factories were to be fully employed, the private firms would reduce their machinery, and the Government would be, as a consequence, obliged to put in at Enfield and Woolwich an enormous reserve of plant and machinery and that would be a perpetuation of the evil.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER asked what was the ratio of rifle work in money and rifles as between Government factories and private firms.

MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT said he could not state that at the moment; but he thought he was right in saying that it was half and half.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER asked if that was money or rifles.

MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT said it was the value of the production.

*COLONEL BOWLES (Middlesex, Enfield) said that that was a very important question, because the rifle produced in the Government factories cost £3 10s. 6d., whereas the rifle produced by private firms cost £4 10s., which meant some 30 per cent. more.

MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT said he did not mean money in that sense at all. He thought the hon. Member was calling attention to the conversion of the old rifles, not to new rifles.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER asked if the conditions as to the time allowed were the same.

MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT said the contract for the rifles would terminate at the end of 1905.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said that the hon. Gentleman had not answered the question put by his hon. friend the Member for the Isle of Wight in regard to the delay in providing the guns.

*COLONEL BOWLES said that the Financial Secretary to the War Office suggested that the Government did not include rent or interest on money in the price of the rifle manufactured by the Government. It was not quite fair to put it in that way, because in all those accounts a certain amount had been allowed for all such charges. In considering this matter, the House, in order to be perfectly fair as between the Government factories and private firms, should understand what the cost of the rifles really was. He thought that the price now given to the trade was excessive. He agreed that a large proportion of the work should be given to the trade, as it both stimulated the Government factories and the trade; but it was right that the country should have some guidance as to the price that was being paid; and he hoped that the Government factories would be given an opportunity of producing their figures as well as private firms.

SIR CARNE RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford) said that, as an old musketry instructor, he did not think that there was much fault to be found with the new rifle. It was better balanced, was easier to handle, and had a lower trajectory.

He did not understand the objection of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Forest of Dean to the retubing of the old guns. That was really a matter of economy. He should like to refer to the weight of the cavalry saddles, bridles, and swords. He could not conceive any worse or more useless weapon than the cavalry sword. It was badly balanced; it was heavy where it should be light, and light where it should be heavy. He would prefer to fight a man with a broomstick rather than with such a weapon. He could not understand why the saddles and bridles were made so enormously and ridiculously heavy. They were, it was true, better than they used to be; but that was not saying much. The bridles had pounds of steel which were quite unnecessary; and that also applied to the saddles. It was said that the heavier they were the longer they would last. That was perfectly true; but if it were carried to its logical conclusion, they might be made heavier and heavier until they would last forever, but then an elephant would be required to carry them. That was really no argument at all. Although the weight had been considerably reduced, yet, at present, a dragoon rode at eighteen stone, and a hussar, who was supposed to be a light cavalry man, at fourteen stone. There was an immense amount of hide-bound red tape which prevented the weight being reduced. The obvious thing was that the kit and the cooking tins should not be carried on the horse. They should be carried on squadron carts. If that were done the cavalry would be infinitely more mobile; and he ventured to suggest to the mind of the intelligent Secretary of State for War that that would make the cavalry more useful.

Resolution agreed to.

SUPPLY [12TH APRIL].

Resolutions reported.

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1904–5.

1. "That a sum, not exceeding £3,646,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expense of Naval Armaments, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905."

2. Sec. 1. "That a sum, not exceeding £3,044,200, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expenses of the Personnel for Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, &c., including the cost of Establishments of Dockyards and Naval Yards at Home and Abroad, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905."

3. Sec. 2. "That a sum, not exceeding £5,062,800, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expense of the Matériel for Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, &c., including the cost of Establishments of Dockyards and Naval Yards at Home and Abroad, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905."

4. "That a sum, not exceeding £2,428,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expense of Victualling and Clothing for the Navy, including the cost of Victualling Establishments at Home and Abroad, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905."

5. "That a sum, not exceeding £293,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expense of Medical Services, including the cost of Medical Establishments at Home and Abroad, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905."

6. "That a sum, not exceeding £15,500, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expense of Martial Law, including the cost of Naval Prisons at Home and Abroad, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905."

7. "That a sum, not exceeding £72,600, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expenses of Scientific Services, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905."

8. "That a sum, not exceeding £404,500, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expenses of the Royal Naval Reserve, the Royal Fleet Reserve (including Seamen Pensioner Reserve), and the Royal Naval Volunteers, &c., which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905."

9. "That a sum, not exceeding £444,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the

Expense of various Miscellaneous Effective Services, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905."

10. "That a sum, not exceeding £796,200, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expense of Half Pay, Reserved, and Retired Pay, to Officers of the Navy and Marines, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905."

11. "That a sum, not exceeding £353,300, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expense of Civil Pensions and Gratuities, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905."

Resolutions read a second time.

First Resolution.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Commiteee in the said Resolution."

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) complained that these Naval Votes had rather suddenly been sprung upon the House; that two days ago the Prime Minister had stated that he only proposed to take Votes 1 and 8, and therefore he (Mr. Robertson) moved that this particular item be postponed, and that the same course should be taken with the following Votes.

*The **SECRETARY** to the **ADMIRALTY** (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge) said he consented to the Motion.

Motion made, and Question "That the debate be now adjourned"—(*Mr. Edmund Robertson*)—put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed upon Monday next.

Second Resolution.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON said with regard to the subject matter of this Vote he might remind the House that when the Naval Votes were last before the Committee of Supply the serious discussion as to the naval programme of the year was by general consent postponed to a later date, and he did not propose to go into that matter now, but to wait until the new policy of the Admiralty was stated. There were only one or two points to which he would call attention. One was the question of boilers.

*Mr. **SPEAKER** was understood to rule that the question of boilers could not be raised upon this Vote.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON said that in Committee of Supply the Committee had been allowed to discuss the whole question on this particular Vote but if Mr. Speaker ruled that he was out of order in discussing it now he would reserve what he had to say on that point. What he really wished to do, so far as Mr. Speaker's ruling would permit, was to call the special attention of the House to the unique circumstances under which this Vote was being taken this year. One of the most remarkable examples of the way in which the financial control of this House was being curtailed was that after the House had limited by its Rules the number of days on which Supply was to be discussed they found that a large portion of the time allotted for the discussion of Supply was taken up by the discussion of private business. The Government was not responsible for this, nor was the official whose duty it was to regulate private business in the House. He made no complaint with regard to it and merely desired to point out that on every occasion when Supply was to be discussed——

*Mr. **SPEAKER** said that this subject was not relevant to the Vote under discussion.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON said he was induced to mention the fact because of the circumstance that a great portion of the time of the Evening Sitting was to be occupied by the discussion of a private Bill. What he wanted to know, in the interest of public business, was what would be the exact financial result of passing this Resolution. The House must remember that this Resolution had been suddenly sprung upon it, and that in answer to an inquiry he made, it was stated that it was necessary for Treasury reasons. That immediately put him on the scent of his right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The real reason why this Vote was to be passed to-day was that it would enable the Admiralty to get hold of money which had been granted for other purposes, by the one Consolidated Fund Act that had been passed this session, for naval purposes. Few Members of Parliament were aware of the fact recently stated by the Chancellor of the Exchequer that under the Public Accounts and Charges Act of 1891 it was possible to direct to Navy or Army purposes money voted by the House for Civil Service purposes. He might be permitted to say that the money granted at the beginning of the session for Naval Supply amounted to about twelve weeks supply, while that for the Army was about three weeks supply, and that for the Civil Services about twenty-three weeks supply. It might very well be that the naval money was now exhausted because they were now told that the large sum granted in the beginning of the year for Civil Services would have to be made available for the Naval Vote. That was a matter that was well worth the serious consideration of the House, because it was owing to that fact that the House now found itself in this extraordinary position. Everything would be legitimised if these Resolutions were followed by Resolutions of Ways and Means to provide the money, and by the setting up of a new Consolidated Fund Bill. That was an old constitutional practice of the House which the Chancellor of the Exchequer understood as well as anybody.

*Mr. SPEAKER said he failed to see how this subject could be raised on the Resolution now before the House.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON said his point was that the passing of these Resolutions would have a most unusual consequence unless followed by the practice which he had indicated. It would mean the allocation of money granted for one purpose to quite a different purpose.

Mr. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.) asked whether the Committee were not entitled to information from the Chancellor of the Exchequer as to whether if they passed this Resolution there was any security that the money would be expended on the purposes for which it was voted.

*Mr. SPEAKER said that that point could not be raised on the question of whether or not the sum mentioned was one which ought to be voted for the purpose named in the Resolution. He would not raise any objection to a Question being asked and answered across the floor of the House, but he was bound to object to a discussion as to what was the legal and constitutional method of ultimately dealing with the Supply, whether by a Consolidated Fund Bill, by the Appropriation Bill at the end of the session or by a Resolution under the Act of 1891. The question here was whether the sum named was a proper sum to be granted.

Mr. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) asked whether it was not open to his hon. friend to point out the inconvenience of the Committee voting this sum of money for a particular purpose when there was reason to believe it would be applied to another purpose.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) thought the point the hon. Member desired to raise had reference to the effect of Section 2 (1) of the Public Accounts and Charges Act, 1891, and he submitted that that was not a matter that could be discussed in Committee of Supply or on Report. The course of action was laid down by statute and the action of the Treasury was in pursuance of the statute.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) pointed out that the statement of the right hon. Gentleman was the converse of the argument of the hon. Member for Dundee, whose complaint was that money already capable of being issued under the Act of 1891 would be issued for this service if the Resolution were voted. Was it not pertinent to the passing of the Resolution that the House should consider what its effect would be?

*Mr. SPEAKER said it would not be pertinent to inquire whether, after the money was granted, it was likely the

Treasury would act legally or illegally in appropriating money for the purposes named in the Resolution. That question did not arise on the Vote in Committee of Supply or on Report.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said the question of the Treasury acting legally or illegally did not arise. There was no Question that the Treasury could legally take money voted for the Civil Service, and, if this Resolution were passed, apply it to the purposes of the Navy; and that, he believed, was the objection entertained by the hon. Member opposite to the passing of the Resolution.

*MR. SPEAKER said that made it quite clear that the question referred to by the hon. Member for Dundee could not arise on the Resolution, as the suggestion was simply that something would take place which was perfectly legal under an Act of Parliament. The hon. Member was finding fault with that Act.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said it was extremely difficult to state the point he desired to make. He did not challenge the law as stated by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. What he wanted to point out was that on the facts of the present year the passing of this Resolution would have serious consequences. Money granted for the Civil Service in the first Consolidated Fund Act might, would, and must be applied by the Government to purposes other than that for which it was voted.

*MR. SPEAKER: I still think that this is not in order on this Resolution.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said he had nearly finished all he intended to say on the matter, and he thanked Mr. Speaker for the consideration he had shown him.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport) called attention to the manner in which a man permanently injured in the service of the Admiralty had been treated by the Department. The Admiralty had a scheme, to which the employees had assented, by which they contracted out of the Workmen's Compensation Act. The man to whose case he desired to refer had been permanently injured through a piece of timber falling on his head, and the Admiralty, instead of giving the man a pension or compensation in accordance with their agreement—under which persons permanently disabled were promised $\frac{24}{60}$ths of their last emoluments—had simply made him an allowance for six months, at the end of which period the case was to be further considered. The accident happened sixteen months ago and he submitted that the Admiralty ought now to deal with the case in the manner provided for by the agreement. There was no doubt whatever as to the total and permanent disablement, and it was extremely hard that the sufferings of the man should be aggravated by the anxiety and worry connected with the uncertainty of the future. If the workman was in a position to lodge a complaint with the Registrar of Friendly Societies, an inquiry would be held, and the power of contracting out withdrawn from the Admiralty. The matter was a most important one as the case was merely typical of many, and he would be glad to hear the Admiralty's explanation of the business. He wished to raise another question. A couple of months ago he pointed out the rental conditions of Devonport and that it would be only fair to make the same arrangements there as appertained in London by which the police received lodging allowance on a scale according to the conditions of the rent they had to pay. The Home Secretary gave an undertaking that he would have an inquiry held by the Chief Commissioner of Police, and that if what he had stated was found to be true he would make allowance as in the Metropolis. He had given the Home Secretary three hours notice that the question was going to be raised, but the right hon. Gentleman had not yet arrived in the House. Under those circumstances he did not know what his rights would be. Had he to continue speaking until the right hon. Gentleman came in? [AN HON. MEMBER: You had better not sit down.] Meanwhile he would turn to another question, there were a considerable number of discharges going on in Devonport dockyard. He believed about 200 men had been under notice during the last two or three weeks. It might possibly be due to some adjustment between one branch and another.

*MR. PRETYMAN: That is the fact.

MR. KEARLEY said he had mentioned all he desired to say and he did not wish to waste the time of the House by killing time until the Home Secretary should arrive. He thought the right hon. Gentleman might treat the House with more consideration.

*MR. PRETYMAN said he would ask his right hon. friend to give a reply to the question when he came in.

MR. REGINALD LUCAS (Portsmouth) said he had received some correspondence upon the same subject and perhaps his right hon. friend would be able to tell him whether the matter had been considered.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's) said he had made inquiries in Devonport and other dockyards into the circumstances in which the police had to find accommodation. On the whole the rent did not seem to press so heavily on the men in these stations as it did in London, but there was it seemed to him sufficient reason for extending the minimum allowance granted in London of 1s. 6d. per week to such cases in the dockyards as came within the same conditions as governed the grant in London. He saw no reason why the dockyard police should be treated differently, and he was ready to apply the same regulations under the same conditions as applied in London, *e.g.*, that the men lived in approved quarters near their work and necessarily paid 6s. a week and upwards for rent.

MR. BUCHANAN asked for a short statement as to the views of the Government in regard to the naval programme which was laid before the House at the begining of the year. It was more than two months since the Vote was passed in Committee of Supply, and more than three months since the Navy Estimates were laid before the House, and a good deal had happened since then. They were told early in the session that the naval programme might have to be modified, and he pointed out at that time that it was unwise from a financial point of view, when grave problems in naval warfare in the Far East were being solved, to commit this country irretrievably to the full programme of construction, which was exceedingly costly, and in regard to which they were not absolutely clear that they had arrived at the best possible type. He alluded in particular to the expenditure recommended this year, amounting to over £3,000,000, upon the three battleships of the "King Edward VII." type which they were told were of a type that the Admiralty did not originally intended to adopt, but which at the last moment they resolved to build. In regard to the scouts built within the last two or three years that seemed to him to be a rather rash form of expenditure.

*MR. PRETYMAN: That question wil come up under a subsequent Vote.

MR. BUCHANAN said he was only going to say that this was another illustration of the way in which the Admiralty was apt to commit itself somewhat rapidly to a form of construction which would entail a very large expenditure before they were satisfied that it was the best form of ship to construct. This caused them to be suspicious of the way the Admiralty undertook large expenditure. He wished to know whether the Secretary to the Admiralty would during the present session state if the naval programme was going to be modified in any degree, and, if so, would he also say in what way it was going to be modified.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said there had been a good many changes backwards and forwards with regard to Wei-hai-Wei. He noticed on page 120 of the Navy Estimates an expenditure of £500 for a King's Harbour Master and Naval Executive Officer at Wei-hai-Wei. That seemed to indicate that Wei-hai-Wei was now being treated as a dockyard port. He understood that the fortifications had been put an end to, and the only establishment there at the present moment was a naval hospital. In the explanation given by the First Lord of the Admiralty it was said that coaling accommodation had been provided at Wei-hai-Wei, but they had not been informed as to that provision. He was aware that the difficulty was that the entrance to Wei-hai-Wei was very broad, and could not be effectively closed against torpedo attacks; and therefore he thought the House ought to be informed with regard to the provision of coaling accommodation at Wei-hai-Wei. He wished to know if any change had come about as to the use which was to be made of that place. The appointment of a King's Harbour Master seemed to indicate something more had been contemplated.

*MR. PRETYMAN said that in regard to the case mentioned by Mr. Kearley he was sorry he had not given notice. The hon. Gentleman mentioned the case some time ago in the Lobby.

MR. KEARLEY: I gave notice to the Civil Lord in writing.

*MR. PRETYMAN said it was impossible to remember for several months the details of a case of this kind. These cases must be dealt with on their merits, and it was impossible to lay down a general rule. Each case was gone into most carefully. There was every desire that an employee should get something, certainly not worse, but slightly better, than he was entitled to under the Act. He was sure the Civil Lord would look into this particular case, and send a report to the hon. Member. With regard to the point raised by the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean the King's Harbour Master there had the control of the whole water area, and he had no special connection with the hospital or the coaling station. The Admiralty were responsible for the berthing of all ships at Wei-hai-Wei whether they were Admiralty ships or other shipping, and therefore it was necessary to appoint a King's Harbour Master and that was the reason why he was appointed. With regard to the coaling station he explained it to the House two years ago. The amount of coal kept at Wei-hai-Wei was 6,000 tons.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: But this is a new matter this year in the statement of the First Lord accompanying the Estimates.

*MR. PRETYMAN said that was the same matter. He believed that the accommodation had now been completed although it was not completed at the time the statement was issued. There had been no variation from the statement in regard to providing accommodation for 6,000 tons of coal. The question of the hospital was at this moment being considered. The state of affairs in the Far East might altogether change the situation there, and therefore no expenditure at the present moment was being incurred there and the matter had been hung up. He might say, in answer to the definite question of the hon. Gentleman opposite, that no change in the programme already announced was contemplated—namely, two battleships, four armed cruisers, and fourteen destroyers.

Resolution agreed to.

Third Resolution.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said he was sorry to be under the necessity of addressing the House again, but what he had to say about shipbuilding was more relevant to Section 2 than Section 1. He for one, and the hon. Member for East Perthshire for another, refused to admit that the assent of Parliament had been given to the new construction programme of the year. It had never been discussed. It was put off to another occasion two and a half months ago. He thought it was right that the discussion of the new programme should come late rather than early in the year. They were all agreed that they should abstain from discussing new construction on Sections 1 and 2, and that it should be brought up formally on Section 3. This was the 30th of June, and there was still a month available for discussing the Vote. They were promised a day for that Vote. He was perfectly certain that an opportunity would be afforded to the House for the discussion of the new naval programme, but with the Speaker in the Chair it would be a hopeless failure. It could not be properly discussed except in Committee, when hon. Gentlemen could speak more than once, and when they could be answered as often as might be necessary. He only wanted on this occasion to say that he thought they ought to know something now about the overdue Report of the Boiler Committee. There was a Boiler Committee still sitting dealing with the problem of boilers, and perhaps the hon. Gentleman would tell the Committee whether any Report had been presented, and, if so, whether it would be submitted to the House. He had pressed the hon. Gentleman, by means of Questions addressed to him, several times for the report of the Court of Inquiry into the loss of the Submarine A 1. They had abstained from discussing this matter while the Court was sitting, but the inquiry had now been completed, and he thought the House was entitled to have the report of that Court. If the report was confidential something as a substitute for it ought to be produced. His hon. friend the Member for East Perthshire had alluded to the new class of vessels called scouts. There had been a great deal of alarmist literature appearing lately on the subject, and he thought it might be useful if the hon. Gentleman were to give the House some reassuring declaration as to the fitness of this class of vessel for the purpose for which it was designed.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said there was no doubt that the Report of the Boiler Committee had been in the hands of the Admiralty for a considerable time, and there was no reason why it should not have been published at least a month ago. It had been stated, not in the authorised quarters, but in that portion of the Press which dealt with naval questions, that there was considerable difference of opinion in the Admiralty as to the best class of boiler to adopt. It had been said that as the result of the trials which had taken place the new First Sea Lord took a wholly different view from that taken by the Controller of the Navy, though he did not in the least believe that there was any foundation for that statement. As the statement had been made, and as the Report of the Boiler Committee had been ready for a considerable time, it would be wise to give to the House the authorised opinions of those gentlemen, and if necessary a note from the Admiralty themselves on that Report, because all sorts of unauthorised stories were going about. The friends of each class of boilers had their say, and all this could be put an end to by the publication of the Report.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said the introduction of the new class of scouts was the most important departure the Government had taken for many a long day. He asked for information in regard to the new vessels. If they were successful they would entirely obviate the necessity of subsidising the merchant fleet. They were contrived and designed for the sole purpose of replacing the merchant cruisers—the Cunarders—but, as the right hon. Gentleman had said, very considerable doubt had been thrown upon one of their most important features, namely, their area of action. An article in *The Times* had raised the doubt, though he believed that it was an absurdly exaggerated article. Certainly the alarmist tone adopted was not in the least justified by the facts. The scout vessels had been represented to be practically useless in carrying sufficient coal for any area of action necessary for a scouting vessel. Personally, he had great hopes of the vessel, though it would be well if the Admiralty would give the House a reassuring account of the scout class of vessel so as to dispel the deep suspicion which had been cast upon it by *The Times* article. He had advocated the adoption of oil fuel for the Navy for the last dozen years. He believed that there was a large amount of oil fuel in the country, and he understood that an experiment with this fuel had been carried out. Was the Admiralty satisfied that there were adequate supplies of oil fuel in this country? In his opinion oil fuel doubled the area of action of ships, and it was no exaggeration to say that it was worth twice as much to a ship as coal. The consideration for the Navy was whether we could have a sufficient supply of oil fuel in this country. He believed we could. The Estimates contained a sum amounting to over £2,000,000 for coal in the dockyards. Was it the practice of the Admiralty when foreign war vessels entered our ports to allow them to take in a supply of coal, or were the foreign war vessels referred to the private trader? Care had to be exercised in this matter for fear of creating a breach of the laws of neutrality in helping what might possibly be a belligerent vessel. Was a condition enforced upon such vessels to the effect that the coal would only be used to allow the vessels to go back to their own ports and not for belligerent purposes?

Mr. PRETYMAN said that the idea of building these scouts was that they should have equal speed but a greater radius of action than destroyers; and, therefore, they would avoid the necessity of any Admiral commanding a fleet using destroyers for purely scouting purposes when they were required for other purposes. That was the real origin of these scouting ships. Eight of them were being built. The purpose for which these vessels had been specially designed was to accompany a fleet and clear out the smaller craft which might endanger the safety of the fleet. It was not intended to lay down any more of this class until the value of the eight now under construction had been actually tested. The hon. Member for King's Lynn had referred to an article in *The Times* in which the figures quoted were considerably overdrawn. The whole gravamen of that article was in respect of the coal supply, but there was a mistake in the figures quoted, viz., that when these vessels were steaming at their normal draught they would be only carrying 150 tons of coal. That was not the fact. The draught which was imposed at their trials required them to carry sufficient coal to steam 3,000 miles at a speed of ten knots, and the quantity would vary slightly in different vessels. These vessels were not designed by the Admiralty. They had been frequently told that it was thought desirable to give an opportunity to eminent private naval draughtsmen to design ships for the Royal Navy and give them a free hand. In this particular case the private firms in this country had been given that opportunity provided that they could fulfil the particular requirements as to speed and radius of action. They were permitted to send in their own specifications and designs, and the result was the eight vessels were now under construction. Four firms were building them—two each. Messrs. Armstrong; Vickers; Fairfield; and Cammell, Laird and Company. Each of these vessels fulfilled the requirements of the Admiralty, although there were certain variations in the coal-bunker capacity. The largest capacity was 600 tons, which was considerably more than was indicated in *The Times* article. He joined issue with the hon. Member in his statement that a third-class cruiser would be a better vessel for the purpose for which these vessels were designed. The cost of a scout was very much the same as a third-class cruiser, which could only proceed at the rate of twenty-two knots an hour, but which had a more powerful armament. In the case of the scout they had the extra speed and so they had to sacrifice something in the way of armament. The purpose of the scout was that it should be able to approach an enemy's fleet consisting of a number of swift cruisers, and be able to escape and return and give information to the Admiral Commanding-in-Chief. It was perfectly clear that a third-class cruiser armament would give her no advantage, because she would not be able to fight a swift first or second-class cruiser of the enemy's fleet, and therefore her armament in that particular respect would be wasted, while the extra three-knots speed of the scout would be far more useful for the particular purpose he had indicated. The Admiralty had never claimed, and did not now claim, that these scouts would be fit for ocean work. They were fitted specially for Mediterranean work, and would be useful also for Channel work within the compass of their radius of action. But they were not designed for long-distance ocean work. It was not pretended that they were designed to accompany a fleet across the Atlantic. What it came to was this—that they were costly vessels, perhaps, but that they were the cheapest vessels and the smallest which could steam twenty-five knots for eight hours in succession; and that really was the problem set to the designers of the private firms. At the same time, they could steam 3,000 miles at the rate of ten knots an hour. When these eight scouts had been tested at sea, they would then be in a position to decide whether they ought to ask the House to vote money for more of them.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES asked if he was right in saying that while at ten knots the scouts could steam 3,000 miles, at twenty-five knots they could steam only 200 miles.

*MR. PRETYMAN said that 3,000 miles at ten knots was limited by coal capacity, and twenty-five knots for eight hours was not limited by coal capacity. The limit was that of the engine power. The scouts could not steam twenty-five knots an hour for more than eight hours without some relaxation of the strain on the machinery. The destroyers could steam only twenty-five knots an hour for not more than four hours.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES asked if the scouts could steam twenty-five knots for eight hours, and then, after being eased down, steam another twenty-five knots.

*MR. PRETYMAN: Certainly. With regard to the inquiry into the loss of Submarine A1 he understood a statement was desired on a subsequent Vote.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said that the House was promised very definitely that there should be a general statement, not only a statement with reference to the loss of Submarine A1.

*MR. PRETYMAN said he would be perfectly prepared to make a statement; but he thought it could be made with better effect on a future occasion.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON asked if the report of the inquiry would be issued.

*MR. PRETYMAN said he was afraid he could not promise the hon. Gentleman the report of the inquiry. On principle such reports were not published. As to the Boiler Committee, the Admiralty had received an interim Report, and the final Report was daily expected. He was glad to be able to assure the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Forest of Dean that he heard no suggestion of any difference of opinion within the Admiralty or among distinguished naval officers outside the Admiralty with regard to the matter. As to oil fuel, it was a most important question, to which the Admiralty had for some time been devoting a great deal of attention. It was a question, however, which in the interests of the Navy he would not deal with at any great length. He would, however, refer to two points. If a supply could be obtained from within the British Empire, which would be accessible in war time, then he thought the requirements would be met. The point, however, was not as to whether a supply was or was not in the British Empire, but whether the supply would be available both in peace and war, and whether they should be able to develop in peace time supplies that would be available in time of war. He could inform the hon. Gentleman that there was a prospect, certainly a possibility, of such a supply being obtained. That was the point of view from which the matter was being considered by the Admiralty. The hon. Gentleman said that oil fuel would double the radius of action; but he did not wish the House to accept that statement as being endorsed by the Admiralty. There were many advantages in the use of oil fuel; but one point should not be lost sight of, and that was that coal was abundant and obtainable in all quarters of the globe; and until oil was equally available it would be impossible to rely upon it solely for fuel. If the experiments in oil which were now being made by the Admiralty were successful, and if adequate supplies of oil were available, no doubt the proper arrangement would be the use of coal and oil in combination as fuel. In that way a considerable amount of labour in the stokehole would be avoided. With regard to the supply of coal by the Admiralty to foreign warships, as a general rule foreign warships obtained their supplies from the ordinary merchants of the port. But if the Admiralty were desired for a special reason, and as a matter of courtesy and convenience, to supply coal to a warship of another Power, they would consider the application on its merits. It would only be granted under exceptional circumstances and with the most careful safeguards.

MR. BUCHANAN said that the House was indebted to the hon. Gentleman for his statement, which justified the criticisms which had been advanced. If the Admiralty were engaged in totally novel experiments, they ought to be conducted on a limited scale; and should not involve the country in more expense than was absolutely necessary. Hon. Gentlemen opposite always asked if the House was going to refuse expenditure on the Navy. They did not want to refuse expenditure; but they wanted to know whether it was necessary or not. He gathered that the scouts were something between a third-class cruiser and a destroyer; and that they cost about the same as a third-class cruiser, and three times as much as a destroyer. The Admiralty might be justified in making these experiments, but in common prudence they should not have embarked on a scheme necessitating the building of eight ships, but have contented themselves with experimenting with two or, at the outside, three vessels. He did not pretend to follow the whole subject, but the way it came home to the laymen of the House like himself was that it was of little use for these ships to go at a speed of twenty knots from Gibraltar to Malta, if having done that they had not sufficient coal to come back. It was quite clear that at the present moment the Admiralty were in doubt as to whether this experiment was going to be successful or not. In his opinion, under the circumstances, the House was justified in watching very narrowly any new departure made by the Admiralty having regard to the consequences involved.

Third Resolution agreed to.

Further Consideration of subsequent Resolutions deferred till Monday next.

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Jeffreys (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1904–5.

Class I.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £35,500, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for Expenditure in respect of Royal Palaces."

Mr. WHITLEY (Halifax) said when this Vote was under consideration before he raised the question of excessive expenditure with regard to it. On that occasion the noble Lord succeeded in talking out his own Vote, and it was for the purpose of giving the noble Lord an opportunity of making the statement which he did not then make that he (Mr. Whitley) now proposed to move to reduce the Vote by a sum of £5,000. The expenditure on the Royal Palaces after the King came into residence and the Prince of Wales came to Marlborough House was necessary, as every one would admit, but there was no reason for making it an annual expenditure. He contended that £40,000 was far too large an amount for maintenance and repairs, and he begged to move a reduction of £5,000.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £30,500, be granted for the said service."—(*Mr. Whitley*).

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said as we had a Sovereign and all the appurtenances of Royalty we must behave handsomely to the King and all that belonged to him. There was no more rigid economist than himself, and he had on many occasions attacked Votes and had succeeded in getting them reduced, but if there was one item in the whole category of expenditure in this country that ought to be agreed to it was the item now before the Committee. The sum was really a very small one upon which to keep up the state of magnificence befitting a country with a Royal Sovereign, and he could not understand the hesitation in voting the money. No doubt there were items in regard to which economies might be effected, but that was a matter to be discussed on the salary of the First Commissioner of Works, who was responsible for any improprieties or extravagances in the Votes, and when the proper occasion arrived he would be prepared to express his opinion of the gentleman at the head of that Department and of the noble Lord so far as the Rules of the House would allow.

Mr. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.) asked whether the works at Holyrood had been completed and whether the Palace was now fit for a human being to live in. A certain amount of money had been spent, and it was desirable that the Committee should be assured that it had been wisely spent, so that in the event of the King again visiting Scotland there would be no obstacle in the way of his occupying Holyrood Palace.

Mr. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid.) pointed out that last year the Vote for Holyrood Palace came to £6,000, and this year it was £2,600. It was obvious, he thought, from that fact that as Holyrood was a very old Palace and one which the King intended to occupy when in Scotland, that the amount of money spent upon it was absolutely inadequate for the purpose of putting the Palace into anything like a proper condition for occupation and for the entertainment and so forth connected with the Court. Speaking of the Vote generally, he thought it ought to be remembered that during the last year or two there had been a larger expenditure on the Palaces in consequence of the accession of the King. It was not, therefore, fair to contrast the figures of the present year with those of recent years. He thought, however, that some explanation should be given of the £1,000 for wine cellars at St. James's Palace.

Mr. TOMKINSON (Cheshire, Crewe) asked for an explanation of the large expenditure proposed on the Royal kitchen gardens at Windsor.

Lord BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley) said the sum proposed to be spent on the kitchen gardens at Windsor was doubtless unusually large, but it was for the carrying out of new works and improvements which ought really to have been effected during the last twenty years. With regard to the £1,000 for wine cellars at St. James's Palace, as there were at present no wine cellars at Buckingham Palace, all the wine was kept at St. James's Palace, and it was considered absolutely necessary that the wine cellars there, which were extremely ill-fitted and ill-constructed, should be improved. As to the complaint brought by the hon. Member for Halifax, the charge of extravagance was of a very general character, and therefore it was possible to give only a very general reply. It was said that the cost of maintenance and repairs was especially extravagant, but he did not think that £40,000 was an excessive expenditure. On the contrary, he believed it was very moderate, considering the scale of magnificence and the number of the Royal Palaces which had to be maintained. Moreover, it had to be remembered that a number of the Palaces had altogether ceased to be residences of the Sovereign, and had become nothing more nor less than places of pleasure and public resort. Hampton Court, for instance, cost £6,000 a year for maintenance and repairs, an insignificant sum considering the amount of profit and pleasure the public deprived from it. As showing how it was appreciated, he mentioned that the picture galleries alone were last year visited by 620,000 people, while the National Gallery, which was right in the heart of London, was only visited by 457,000 during the same period. Hampton Court had long ceased to be a Royal residence, and as one of the most beautiful and interesting buildings in Europe the expenditure upon it would not be grudged. The repairs and drainage at Holyrood were concluded, and an independent authority had pronounced the building to be in a sound habitable condition. It could not be justly said that Holyrood was starved, and should His Majesty have occasion to take up his residence there some improvements in furnishing would be all that would be required. Last year the sum spent at Holyrood was larger than the sum spent at Buckingham Palace. This year they were spending £2,600 there as compared with £4,000 at Buckingham Palace.

Mr. JOHN BURNS (Battersea) appealed to the noble Lord not only to bear in mind the observations of the hon. Member for King's Lynn, with which he entirely agreed in regard to the Royal Palaces, but also to remember that there ought to be some differentiation between Royal Palaces in the personal occupancy of the Crown and the other Royal Palaces which frequently sheltered themselves behind His Majesty's Privy Purse and the Civil List. His Majesty ought to have an inclusive sum to spend in whatever way he pleased. He was in favour of equal rights for all white men, and the House of Commons had no right to intrude into the private affairs of anybody high or low. He thought the item of £6,000 for Hampton Court Palace gave good value to the public, but he would like to know what the £1,350 for new works was for. It might be for new bicycle sheds for the pensioned tenants at Hampton Court, or it might be for new and ornate outhouses for keeping petroleum for their motor-cars and lamps. He did not think that His Majesty ought to be debited with what was put up for the convenience of the tenants. Until they differentiated between Royal Palaces and ex-Royal Palaces occupied by officials and pensioned tenants they could never have economy, because these people sheltered themselves behind the general designation of Royal Palace and that disarmed criticism. There was also a sum of £2,080 for new works, alterations, and additions at St. James's Palace. If that was spent upon State rooms he did not mind, but he wanted to know how much of it was spent upon official residences. He knew the average official pretty well, and he generally fastened himself on to a public building, first in two rooms, then probably in four, five, six, and ten rooms; then he managed to appropriate part of the Royal garden as a lawn and another piece for a tennis court. At Hampton Court great golf courses were being laid out and had been used for years for this purpose and they spoiled the beauty of the view.

He came now to another point the Lord Chamberlain's residence, in respect of which there was a charge of £300. Here was a point for fair criticism. The charge was for raising the height of bedrooms in the cottage of one of the officials in residence, and that struck him as being an unreasonable amount; but because it was bracketed with the £40,000 for Royal Palaces, they were prevented from giving it that criticism which it deserved. He would suggest that in future Estimates they should get a statement of the charges for Royal Palaces and gardens proper, and for ex-Royal Palaces; and further, that the expenditure proposed to be incurred in connection with officials who did not belong to the personal *entourage* of the King and Queen should be entirely separate. If that were done, they would be able to criticise the various accounts submitted to them. He thought Hampton Court Palace was more beautiful than Fontainebleau. The Palace and gardens were the most beautiful in Europe, but he was convinced that scores of thousands of pounds had been spent on that Palace in the last forty or fifty years in carrying out the whims, fads, and transient caprices of the tenants in residence, and the House of Commons ought to put a stop to that kind of expenditure. The noble Lord deserved credit for the way in which he had severely jumped on some of the tenants, and prevented them from vandalising that beautiful structure. These officers and tenants had had too big a dip into the Treasury purse, and the time had arrived when that should be resisted and restricted. The only way in which it could be restricted and economy secured was to differentiate the different items in the Estimates in future so that they would be able to bring criticism to bear where it was due.

MR. WHITLEY asked leave to withdraw the Amendment

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £69,100, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens."

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said he wanted to make a claim for the extension of the ride in Hyde Park into Kensington Gardens. The present arrangement had become a matter of very great discredit to the capital. The ride in Hyde Park was so short and inadequate that it really did not by any means fulfil the purposes of such a ride in a metropolis like this. Years ago, he was informed, it was customary for riders to ride in Kensington Gardens along the broad avenue of trees where nobody was ever to be found—not so much as a nursery-maid or a baby, and where, consequently, riders might go without doing any injury to anybody. There was a very strong feeling among riders in the Park, who were numbered by thousands, that they had never been properly treated by the First Commissioner of Works or this House. This was not a trifling matter. The sum expended on the Row was extremely small, and he thought the House ought to be generous in regard to it. There was no difficulty except in the matter of money. He could get a petition signed by hundreds and thousands of people, but he should prefer to leave this to the intelligence of the noble Lord. The ride really required extension. Even the ride that existed was in a discreditable condition. They trusted that at last they had now found in the noble Lord a generous and appreciative spirit who would give them the boon which they had so long desired.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) said the hon. Member for Lynn Regis was too young to remember the circumstances in connection with this matter. When the Great Exhibition of 1851 was built in Hyde Park, riders, as a concession, were allowed to ride in a certain portion of Kensington Gardens. The reason why this was done away with was that the nursery-maids found it somewhat difficult to look after their charges and enjoy the flirtations of military people. They got Members of the House of Commons to plead their case, and this House was so very gallant to the nursery-maids that riders were deprived of their right to go into Kensington Gardens. He did not see why they should not be allowed to ride into Kensington Gardens. In the Bois de Boulogne there were forty miles of a ride. Riding up and down the Row must be very dull work, even if the riders were admired by the people who came to look at them. If the noble Lord could come to some arrangement with the nursery-maids everybody would think it desirable that riders should be allowed to go into Kensington Gardens.

MR. TENNANT (Berwickshire) called attention to the condition of the roads in St. James's Park and Hyde Park. The surface of the roads from Storey's Gate to St. James's Palace was very discreditable. The surface of the roads from St. James's Palace, and from Buckingham Palace up Constitution Hill to Hyde Park Corner, and even in Hyde Park itself, was in holes, and the effect must be to wear out the tyres of carriages in a most extraordinary manner.

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Resolution to be reported upon Monday next; Committee also report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

TYNESIDE TRAMWAYS AND TRAMROADS BILL [LORDS] (BY ORDER.)

Order for Consideration, as amended, read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill, as amended, be now considered."

*SIR JAMES WOODHOUSE (Huddersfield) asked the House to reconsider the decision which had been arrived at by the Committee upstairs in regard to the Bill. He was conscious of the reluctance which the House always felt to reconsider the decisions of its Committees, but under special circumstances, and when those decisions involved a far-reaching issue beyond anything affecting the particular locality primarily interested in the Bill, it had constantly been the habit of the House to ask for such reconsideration. The Bill before the House did involve such far-reaching issues, which the municipalities of the country regarded as of very serious importance to the interests of the ratepayers and the public generally. It would probably be urged that it would have been more proper and convenient to raise the question on the Order for the Second Reading, and he did not deny that that would have been better; but the only object which the Newcastle Corporation authorities had in abstaining was consideration for the time of the House, together with a belief that the Committee would not give the powers sought for. The hon. Member went on to describe the systems of the Newcastle Corporation and the Tyneside Tramways Company, by whom the present measure was being promoted, and explained that the Corporation had a double track of twenty-three miles, with one mile and a quarter of single track. There were 170 cars in actual use, and about twenty building. Over £1,250,000 of capital had been expended, 38,500,000 passengers were annually being carried, and the car mileage was nearly 4,000,000, while the rate of expenditure to receipts was about 65 per cent. That was the position of the corporation tramways. The company's system was three and a half miles of double track and five and a half miles of single track. The number of cars was twenty-two, the capital expended £135,000; and the number of passengers carried annually was 2,500,000, and the rate of expenditure in proportion to receipts was 90 per cent. Those were the respective positions of the corporation and the Tyneside company, and what the latter sought to do by the Bill was to connect up its system at its western boundary with the eastern boundary of the corporation on each of two routes, known as the higher and the lower, so as to form one continuous system, and similarly to extend the Gosforth system in the north.

Of course, the Committee upstairs no doubt had desired to know, as that House would desire to know, what was the grievance which the Tyneside company had, and what case they could make out, to induce Parliament to give them the running powers which they sought over the twenty-three miles of the corporation tramway system, over eleven miles of which the Committee had actually recommended that such powers should be granted. It was specially necessary that a good case should be made out, because on the one hand, they had a private dividend-earning company, and on the other they had the fact that the running powers sought were over a system maintained by the ratepayers of Newcastle. Of course, it was agreed that a case of public necessity must be made out in order to induce Parliament to agree to such an extraordinary use of the corporation system as the granting of compulsory running powers over it by a private company. It was said that the grievance of the public, which the company sought to remedy, was that there was a large population at Wallsend, just beyond the corporation system terminus, but upon the company's own evidence it could not be denied that of the travelling public not more than one-fifth got into the company's cars on arriving at the city boundaries. It went without saying that everyone would like to travel from point to point by a through route, but a great city like Newcastle, in the regulation of its tramway system, had to consider what was practicable with regard to through routes. It was given in evidence in this case that the best use possible had been made of through routes from the far west to the far east. It was impossible to give the convenience sought by the company without dislocating or upsetting the existing system and inconveniencing hundreds of thousands for the purpose of obliging the few passengers who lived in or travelled from or beyond Wallsend. It was proposed that there should be alternate cars, but the company's cars were not to run further west than the centre of the city, so that the through route would be turned from an eight-minute into a sixteen-minute service. What was the public demand for the Bill? He had sought in vain to find more than the petitions of fifty-five manufacturers concerned in Tyneside industries, a large number of whom are interested in the company. It was said they represented 27,000 workmen, but the evidence of these workmen themselves was all the other way. The local authorities, who represented two-thirds of the 100,000 population served by the company, were either opposed or were neutral. Only the Wallsend local authority was in favour of it, and many of its members were interested in the company. The effect of establishing the principle of granting compulsory running powers of this kind would be very far-reaching and would not be confined to the locality. It was as the spokesman of a unanimous meeting of the representatives of the municipalities of the country that he asked to send the Bill back for further consideration by the Committee. There was no precedent for granting compulsory powers of this kind, except under very special circumstances. The case of the Bournemouth tramways was referred to before the Committee as a precedent for granting these compulsory powers, but it was a very exceptional case. He invited the House to consider what had happened in that case, because it illustrated the danger to which municipalities would be exposed if these powers were granted by Parliament. In the Bournemouth case a light railway was stated to be in course of promotion from Christchurch to Poole, running through Bournemouth. The Bournemouth Corporation opposed the scheme because they said the roads through Bournemouth were not suitable for it, and the result was that powers to run through Bournemouth were refused. Bournemouth in the following year came to Parliament and asked for power to construct a tramway system over the very roads on which the Light Railway Commission had decided that it was impossible to construct tramways; and the Committee, regarding the action of the corporation as something in the nature of a breach of faith, granted the company running powers over the proposed lines. What happened? Bournemouth having got the tramways, and the private company having got the running powers, which, by the way, they had never exercised, the company was now making a claim against the corporation, which had gone to arbitration, for £50,000 in respect of these running powers. Compensation for licences was not in it with that sort of procedure. It, however, had opened the eyes of the municipalities of the country, and it was for that reason that they appealed to Parliament to protect them against the mulcting of the ratepayers of the country by private companies for compensation, and against enhancing the value of private undertakings in this way at the public expense. Precisely the same thing might be done in this case of Newcastle without any warrant. He asked that the Bill should be reconsidered in the light of these facts, and he hoped that the Committee presided over by the hon. Member for South Somerset might be able, without infringing the principle for which he was contending, to arrive at some mutually satisfactory arrangement. It was for that reason that, instead of meeting the Bill with a direct negative, he asked that it should be reconsidered. He was perfectly satisfied that the corporation of Newcastle-on-Tyne had endeavoured to meet the public convenience in this matter, because they had proposed to run their cars right through to the centre of Wallsend, and in order to obviate any further inconvenience they had offered to give the benefit of the whole fares received for the last half mile, which was on the company's system, to the company. There was no doubt that if compulsory running powers were given to this company they would enormously enhance the value of their undertaking.

*SIR WALTER PLUMMER (Newcastle-on-Tyne) said that, in seconding the Motion, he believed that under present circumstances the time of Parliament could not be better occupied than in the discussion of this important question. A great principle was at stake, viz., the principle of compulsory powers as distinguished from voluntary agreement. It was true that Newcastle was at the present moment only concerned, but he was convinced that if this Bill passed in its present form, there was no other city in the country which would be safe from similar inroads. It was not a question whether two different tramway systems should have power to arrange through traffic, but whether one system should have compulsory powers over another, notwithstanding the great difference between them in regard to mileage and capital expenditure. The capital expenditure on the corporation tramway system was seven times greater than that of the private company, the car mileage was eight times greater, the number of cars was eight times greater, the amount of receipts was ten times greater. For the year ending 25th June the corporation system of tramways had carried 40,000,000 passengers and the cars had travelled over 4,000,000 miles. He quoted these figures because he was aware that a good deal would be heard in the course of the discussion about the convenience of the public; but care should be taken to suit the convenience of the majority of the public and not sacrifice that to the convenience of the minority. He believed in the greatest good for the greatest number. He ventured to contend that neither the company nor the corporation had started their tramway systems in a purely philanthropic spirit. They were started, as most things were in this material world, because it was believed that the tramways would pay. Certainly he knew that the ratepayers of Newcastle would never have sanctioned the expenditure of £1,100,000 from purely philanthropic motives, or unless they believed that they would retain full control over the system, and not be compelled to allow a private company to use their streets and lines. Different views were held with regard to municipalisation. He was one of those who had voted against the municipalisation of these tramways, but he felt that once the system was sanctioned, it was his duty loyally to endeavour to make it a success. It was because they believed that that success depended upon the corporation having full control of the streets and of their own tramways, that they felt so keenly this invasion by a private company. It seemed to him that the value of municipalisation would be reduced to a minimum if, after the corporation of Newcastle-on-Tyne had spent over a million sterling upon their tramways, they were compelled to admit small private companies to use their system. The Bill dealt with east and north of Newcastle, but if once it was established, a similar company would soon approach them from the west, while the tramway systems of every other city in the kingdom would be imperilled. From the point of view of the public convenience they had offered to run their cars out to Wallsend, the chief centre of population, and to erect there, at the point of junction of the two systems, a comfortable waiting room for the small number of passengers who would want to continue their journey further east. He did not believe that Parliament would compel the 'bus proprietors of the metropolis to establish through routes everywhere. The thing was impracticable. Yet every day hundreds of thousands of people had to change twice or three times in order to get to and from their places of business and their residences. The question of public inconvenience had been magnified out of all proportion to its true value. The corporation of Newcastle had offered to extend their services on the two main routes, to deal with exceptional traffic during race meetings, and to make arrangements for extending the line a half mile east at Wallsend. If the Bill was re-committed they were willing to renew these offers. He was convinced that if the principle in the Bill was sanctioned, it would strike a serious blow at local self-government, and injuriously affect the prosperity and progress of the great municipalities.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out all the words after the word 'Bill,' and add the words 'be re-committed to the former Committee in respect of Clauses 15 and 16.'"—(*Sir James Woodhouse.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

*SIR EDWARD STRACHEY (Somersetshire,S.) said that as Chairman of the Committee which had considered the Bill, he ventured to think that his hon. friends had not approached this subject on any other ground than that of principle; but it was rather late in the day to raise the question of principle after the Bill had passed through the other House, and now came back to the Commons practically for Third Reading, without such principle being raised before. His hon. friend the Member for Huddersfield had asked, on various grounds, that the Bill should be referred back to the Committee. The Committee of this House had declined to give a roving commission to the tramways company, and had struck out the facilities clause which had been passed by the Lords, and had only given the company running powers over a portion of the Newcastle corporation tramways. The hon. Member for Huddersfield said that there was a great distinction between a private tramway company and a corporation. He could not understand what the hon. Member meant by that. The hon. Member seemed to think that it was a right thing for the corporation to carry on a tramway for the benefit of the corporation and a wrong thing for a private company to carry on a tramway for its own benefit so long as it was to the public advantage that they should do so. His hon. friend was connected with private companies, and surely he must think that it was legitimate to make profit out of these private companies. The Newcastle corporation said they did not care about profit, but all that they desired was to do what they liked with their own. It was stated before the Committee that one of the objections to the tramway company was that they allowed advertisements to be placed in their cars, while the corporation sacrificed £4,000 or £5,000 by prohibiting advertisements in their cars, showing that the interests of the ratepayers was not considered in working the trams. When vested interests were talked about, it seemed to him that it was the vested interests of a great corporation which were in question—a corporation which said that they did not want to give facilities of travelling to the public at large by allowing others to invade their sacred grounds. In the old days the great agricultural landlords use to say that they would not allow the amenities of their estates to be interfered with by railways running through their estates, but Parliament compelled them. The sole point of view from which the Committee acted was that the one thing to be considered was, not the susceptibilities of the corporation or whether it would be profitable to the company to run their cars over the lines of the corporation, but whether it was to the interest of the travelling public. The question they had to consider was whether it would be convenient to the working men going to their work and returning to their homes, that there should be a system of through cars from one centre to another. The Committee over which he had the honour to preside was perfectly impartial and acted entirely from a judicial point of view in the public interest.

He was rather surprised that the senior Member for Newcastle should have referred to the manufacturers as he did. Surely the manufacturers had a right to be considered. It was in their interest as well as in the interest of their men that the men should be brought to their work as easily and as cheaply as possible. It had been said that they had had evidence from the trade unions against the Bill. That was quite true; but they had evidence also from working men — whether they were members of trade unions or not he did not know, but they, unlike the trades union witnesses, live outside the corporation area—who maintained that it would be a great convenience to them if these running powers were granted. He noticed that the trades unions of Newcastle had issued a circular to the House in which they stated that the Bill would rob them of their one successful municipal enterprise. He had the greatest sympathy with trade unions, and as a rule supported their demands in this House, and he could not help sympathising with the Newcastle trade unions who had apparently suffered so much from municipal mismanagement and misgovernment and who naturally supported their one successful municipal enterprise. The Bournemouth precedent did not enter into the minds of his Committee at all; but if his hon. friend asked that the Bill should be re-committed in order that a clause should be inserted that any increase of value from these running powers should not be taken into account he would be prepared to agree as he was opposed to such unearned increment. His hon. friend said that many men who broke the journey did not get into the tramcars again. There were two reasons for that. One was that if a man was near his home he did not think it worth while to enter another tramcar. The other was that the tramway company made a mistake in charging a penny instead of a halfpenny. It was suggested that the Bill should be referred back to the Committee to see if they could not get the two parties to agree to some compromise. The question would never have come before the House if a compromise had been possible. It would be more reasonable to suggest that the Bill should not be read a third time until the parties had themselves arrived at a satisfactory compromise. It did not influence the minds of the Committee that this was going to be made a test question

—a question of a municipality against a private concern. He very much regretted it was being dragged from being a local matter into a national matter. The Committees both of the House of Commons and the House of Lords were unanimously of opinion that it was desirable that running powers should be given. No doubt it would have been better if those powers could have been obtained by agreement instead of compulsion. An attempt to arrive at an agreement made in 1902 failed owing to the attitude of the corporation tramways committee. On that occasion, the chairman and vice-chairman of the committee who were in favour of running powers being given were beaten by only one vote and they resigned their positions. His hon. friend stated that the corporation was quite prepared to take over the most paying part of the company's line; but that was an offer to which the company would not agree. It was said that if running powers were given it would lead to the dislocation of the entire system; but his Committee, after careful consideration, did not agree with the statement, and it was provided that the regulations, conditions, and terms under which the running powers were to be exercised should be sanctioned and controlled by the Board of Trade, and that the Board of Trade should have power to appoint an arbitrator to settle such regulations, conditions, and terms if necessary. It had also been said that the company's employees would not observe the regulations of the corporation; but the Board of Trade had ample power with reference to that; and, as a matter of fact, the servants of the company would be, to all intents and purposes, the servants of the corporation while working within their area. He asked the House to consider whether it was wise to decline to accept the decision arrived at by Committees of both Houses and to decide that facilities should not be given which were to afford great masses of population means of being taken out easily and quickly from large centres to the country districts. He approved of municipal trading; but on the other hand he wanted to see it carried out on sane and Imperial lines and not from the narrow and parochial point of view urged that night. He therefore resisted the Amendment.

Mr. HUGH SMITH (Northumberland, Tyneside) said that he formerly supported the corporation in the municipalisation of the tramways. Now he supported the company and the Bill. His constituency was rather mixed in opinion upon this matter. Three distinct authorities had presented petitions in favour of the Bill, and another was opposed to it. Employers of labour, representing 27,000 workmen, had sent a petition in favour of the Bill, but it was said they did not really represent the opinion of the workmen. He was, however, perfectly satisfied in his own mind that the workmen did not care whether it was by the tramway of the corporation or of the company which had compulsory running powers, by which they travelled, so long as they could get to Wallsend. The whole question related to about 600 yards of tramway line which separated the corporation tramway from the centre of Wallsend. Many attempts had been made by the corporation to obtain powers to run a tramway to Wallsend. There were no less than four attempts to arrive at a compromise between the corporation and the company; but they were abortive. The first attempt was in 1903; and a *quasi* agreement was then drawn up. The tramway committee declined to discuss it, and it was thrown out. The second attempt was in 1904. Altogether, four unsuccessful attempts had been made by the company to come to an amicable agreement with the corporation. The Bill was considered for three days by the House of Lords Committee and for four days by the Committee of this House, and now the Motion for the rejection of the measure, which had stood on the Paper for some days, had suddenly been replaced by a Motion for re-committal. He submitted that if the principle was one of the enormous importance alleged, it ought to have been dealt with on the Second Reading. If the Motion were carried there would be another deadlock, as the parties interested were not at one in any way whatever. He welcomed the speech of the hon. Member for Huddersfield, in which the hope was held out that if the Bill were recommitted some arrangement might be come to whereby mutual running powers would be granted.

*SIR JAMES WOODHOUSE said he had simply suggested that the House should not be committed to the principle until it had been inquired into by a Committee, and that in the meantime in this case, as had been done in many other cases, running powers might be arranged by mutual agreement.

MR. HUGH SMITH understood the hon. Member to suggest that there was a likelihood of that being done.

*SIR JAMES WOODHOUSE said he did not represent the Newcastle Corporation. He had taken the matter up on public grounds, in the interests of municipalities generally.

MR. HUGH SMITH asked why there had been all this waste of time and money if there was any chance of a compromise being arrived at? The working classes were to be penalised because they happened to work outside the city boundaries. In days gone by, cities of refuge used to be established for those who had broken the law, but by this Motion there would be set up all over the country cities of privilege, which reminded one not of the twentieth century, but of the middle ages. He earnesly hoped the corporation and the company would come together, so as to avoid what would in the future unquestionably be a grievous disadvantage to the whole community.

MR. BENN (Devonport), in supporting the Motion of the hon. Member for Huddersfield, said the Committee had considered the matter purely from the parochial point of view, and if its decision were upheld an important alteration would have been made in the tramway law of the Kingdom. By the Tramway Act of 1870 the local authority was supreme in regard to tramways within its district, but under the decision of the Committee the municipality would be displaced from that position. He asked the House to consider the question from the London point of view. There was no foundation for the suggestion that the London County Council proposed to exploit the Home counties in tramways matters; they had made, however, and were making, amicable arrangements with their neighbours for running powers which would conduce to the best interests of the public, but they would strongly object to any compulsion. The tramway policy of the London County Council differed considerably from that of any tramway company. Companies very properly aimed at the earning of dividends; the London County Council wisely adopted the policy of pooling all tramway profits so that the money earned in the lucrative districts could be devoted to the establishment of tramways in those localities where trams preceded population. If the principle of this Bill obtained, that beneficent policy would be seriously interfered with. The London County Council system was touched by tramway companies at fifteen points, and if the decision of the Committee were upheld the municipal authority would be bombarded with applications for the admission of companies. How would the selection be made? How would it be possible to secure equal rights for all tramway companies surrounding London? Any such proposal was simply impossible. Moreover, this incursion of tramway companies would seriously interfere with the profit-earning capacity of the municipality. In connection with the Bill under consideration, a suggestion was made for getting over that difficulty. According to the documents circulated by the company, the terms of user were to be left, failing agreement, to the Board of Trade, and the company had offered in Committee that each side should take the net profits earned on its own lines. On the face of it that seemed a reasonable proposition, but what would really happen was that the cars of the company would occupy the place of municipal cars on the lines within the municipality, and if the trade of the town sufficed only for one service of cars the earnings per car-mile would obviously be seriously reduced. Further, were the companies to use the power provided by the municipality for its own scheme? If so, that would raise considerable difficulty. In London, for instance, the London County Council were erecting generating stations for supplying its own service, and it would be able to supply power for these outside companies only by displacing cars of its own. He was not at all opposed to proper arrangements being made for running powers on the border of the city. If a municipality and a corporation could not agree a sufficient remedy already existed, inasmuch as a November election would speedily set matters right in the event of the adoption of an unreasonable attitude by the local authority. A great principle was involved in this Bill. Up to the present Parliament had jealously guarded the rights of municipalities in this respect, and he submitted that if the decision of the Committee were upheld it would be a disastrous thing for the municipalities of the country, and would do much to prevent the travelling public at large obtaining those facilities to which they were entitled.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. BONAR LAW, Glasgow, Blackfriars) said it was not intended to make this a Government question. It was not usual to treat private Bills as Party matters, and no exception to the usual practice would be made on the present occasion. The question, however, had excited much interest in the country, and the House would naturally expect the Government Department which had control of tramway matters to have a definite opinion on the subject and to express it. The Government had a definite opinion on the matter, and he would, as briefly but as strongly as he could, express it. There appeared to be an entire misapprehension as to the issue before the House. From certain speeches which had been delivered one would have supposed that the House was asked to decide whether or not municipalities should own tramways. It that were the issue he would certainly give a vote different from that which he intended to give, because, so far as he was personally concerned, he believed that experience had shown that municipalities could run tramways successfully, and that on the whole they ran them in the interest of the district by which they were elected. But that was not the issue. The importance of the matter had been enormously exaggerated. The question ought to be considered primarily if not entirely, as a matter affecting the locality in which the tramways were running; it was an entire misapprehension to treat it as in any way a question of general principle. That, at any rate, was his opinion. In his official capacity at the Board of Trade it had been his duty to listen to many speeches on the question of tramways in different parts of the country, and the advantages of a through service of trams were continually being pointed out. He ventured to submit that there never was a case in which those advantages were more clearly indicated than in that covered by the Bill. The House would remember a pathetic speech delivered by the hon. Member for Battersea a short time ago in regard to the terrible inconvenience young girls and others were subjected to by having to get out of the trams at Westminster Bridge and find their way by other means, frequently through the pouring rain, to the Embankment. But would not exactly the same inconveniences arise at Newcastle? Were there no young girls at Newcastle? Did it never rain so far north as Newcastle? It was frequently said that the best way of dealing successfully with the housing problems was by a good through system of trams. That argument never applied with more force than to the district concerned in this Bill. The Tyneside Tramways Company's system throughout its course was either bordered by workshops to which men had to go every day, or by land on which buildings for works were being erected and on which still more would be erected if there was a decent through service of trams. But it was really unnecessary to argue the advantages of a through service; everybody would admit them. As to the suggestion that the corporation had put forward an alternative proposal for overcoming the difficulty it should be remembered that they made no alternative proposal of any kind until after a decision had been given against them in another place. Their present proposal had been carefully considered and rejected by the Committee, and he thought the terms of the proposal had only to be stated to convince any impartial man that the Committee could have taken no other course with any show of fair play or justice. The proposal was that the Newcastle Corporation should run their trams over the Tyneside company's system into the heart of Wallsend—that was, through the one populous and paying district, and that the company should have no powers of running cars over the corporation lines.

*SIR JAMES WOODHOUSE pointed out that all the profits were to go to the company.

MR. BONAR LAW said that that was true, but anybody connected with tramways knew that it was not possible to run the remainder of a system at an equally low rate unless they could run cars also on the portion of the system which paid best. But what made the proposal really impossible of acceptance was the fact that the corporation did not propose to run over the whole of the Tyneside Company's system. Had they proposed to do that the decision of the Committee might have been different. The corporation proposed to leave out of account altogether those districts which depended for their profit upon future development. It was urged that those districts were served by the railway, but the only way to compete with the railway was by a through service of trams. The Committee had decided that these facilities were required, and that the method proposed in the Bill was a reasonable way of providing the facilities. The objection of the Newcastle Corporation was that it would seriously interfere with the whole of the tramway system in Newcastle itself. He admitted that the convenience of the greater public had to be considered, and it was considered in this Bill, which simply proposed to do in Newcastle what had been done by agreement in dozens of cases elsewhere. As to the dislocation of the system, surely the difficulties were not greater if it was done by compulsion instead of by voluntary agreement? But the hon. Member himself had stated that if the Bill were recommitted it might be possible to arrange running powers by mutual agreement. Where, then, was the difficulty? If it could be done in the one case, surely it could be done in the other. The Board of Trade, however, was more concerned with the great principle which was said to be involved than with the purely local aspect of the question. He had listened carefully to the speeches with a view to learn what that principle was, and he thought he had found it. He would state it to the House, and if he were wrong he would doubtless be corrected.

MR. BENN: I never made such a statement.

MR. BONAR LAW said the principle was that a private company trading for profit with powers granted by Parliament should not be allowed to have compulsory running powers over lines of tramways when worked by a local authority. He understood that was the principle. [OPPOSITION cries of "Hear, hear!"] Now they had got it. He asked the House was that a principle which any sane man could adopt? Let him point out exactly what it meant. He would assume, for the sake of argument, that the whole fault lay with the corporation and that this difficulty was due to their obstinacy and perhaps to an exaggerated sense of their own importance. The principle he had laid down still held good. According to the contention of hon. Gentlemen opposite, no matter what might be the needs of the district, that district was to have nothing to say in the matter, and the local authority alone must decide and their decision must be final. What was the remedy? The hon. Member suggested an election. Had the hon. Member ever known a district where there was a jealousy existing between a town and a country district? He would state to the House what he thought should be the principle which should guide the House of Commons in this matter. The right to lay down a tramway was granted to a local authority or to a private company, and, the right having been granted, it became a monopoly. As between the two, Parliament gave the preference to the local authority, but once the privilege was given, both parties should be treated exactly in the same way. The question brought for the decision of Parliament was whether through facilities were required, and it was decided that they were, and Parliament in effect said to both parties, "You get your rights from us, and they are given to you not for you to do as you like with them. Through powers are required, and if you do not agree upon terms we will settle the terms for you." That had been done in the present case. The corporation had made an enormous mistake in treating this as a test question, trying to imagine that a new principle was involved. There was no new principle; there were precedents for private companies having running powers over corporation lines. It was argued that there were special circumstances distinguishing these from the present case, but he did not see any difference except in the relative sizes of the districts. In the document sent out by the municipality it was stated that if the principle were affirmed by Parliament a company would only have to construct a short line linking up with a great municipal system, and they would be entitled to running powers over the longer system. Was there a word of truth in that statement? They would have the right to apply for running powers, but they would not obtain such powers unless Parliament were convinced that to grant them would be in the public interest. Would hon. Members say that in the county of Middlesex under no circumstances should a private trading company have running powers over the lines of a local authority, though one authority might have powers over the lines of another local authority? If the House upset the decision of the Committee they would establish the principle that there was to be one scale of justice for private companies and another scale for local bodies. As representing the Board of Trade, he was bound to say that such an action would, in their opinion, be most deplorable. It would be throwing obstacles in the way of private enterprise, and declaring that districts which were served by tramways owned by private companies should be treated in a less fair way than districts served by tramways run by local bodies. He thought this was a case where the decision of the Committee should be upheld.

MR. RUNCIMAN (Dewsbury) said he could not follow the hon. Member's analogy in regard to the principle which guided the Board of Trade in tramway matters. They were not in favour of having these districts isolated, but what they had urged from the first was that, at all events, the corporation should have fair play. The Board of Trade, in holding the balance between municipalities and private companies, ought to have considered the claims of the citizens of Newcastle as well as those who used the Tyneside system. He agreed that running powers were desirable where they were mutually agreed upon, but they should not be forced on one party against their will, either by Parliament or by anyone else. The reason why they regarded this measure as dangerous was that they had in recent years seen an immense growth of municipal enterprise all over the country. Millions of pounds had been spent upon municipal tramways, and if the capital which had been sunk was to be diminished in value in this way by private enterprise stepping in from outside, not only would corporations be deterred from providing municipal tramways, but the property which they now owned would be considerably diminished in value. The hon. Member opposite said that he thought it was unfair that the Newcastle Corporation should invade the Tyneside district and take the cream of the traffic. The case was just the opposite, because the company wished to invade the Newcastle district and take the cream of the traffic on the Newcastle lines owned by the corporation. He did not wish to go into the London analogy, because they could not judge the Newcastle case by anything which took place in London. He wished it to be observed that those who opposed running powers in London had on this occasion entirely changed their attitude, and they were now in favour of compulsory running powers in Tyneside. They were now adopting a new principle which they should apply in their own constituencies. The Newcastle Corporation urged that the district over which the Tyneside company wished to obtain running powers was an immensely crowded district in regard to cars, and he knew no tramway system in the world where a larger number of cars passed per hour than at certain points in this district.

MR. BONAR LAW said there were 6 per cent. more cars in Glasgow.

MR. RUNCIMAN said the Glasgow Corporation viewed the precedent that was being created with the gravest alarm. If even a small matter was imposed upon the Newcastle Corporation, the effect might be to dislocate the most crowded part of their system. That was one of the reasons why they objected to terms being forced upon them which would not suit the system of Newcastle itself, and they urged that Newcastle should receive precedence over the Tyneside Company in the consideration of that House. They had to decide whether it was the Newcastle travelling public or the Tyneside travelling public whose interests ought to be most considered. He thought that Newcastle, with its immense population, should receive precedence over that of the Tyneside population, which was very much smaller, and the Tyneside Company carried a much smaller number of passengers. The view put forward by the supporters of this Bill had not been in the interests of the travelling public, but in the interests of large employers who owned large works in the Tyneside district. He thought they had a right to ask what were the views of the workpeople employed by those manufacturers in the Tyneside district? The workmen who used these cars had expressed the opinion that they did not believe that the Newcastle system should be disturbed simply for the benefit of this tramway company. He thought the views of these workmen ought to have considerable weight with the Members of this House. In this case the Committee had made a serious blunder, because they had allowed these compulsory powers to slip into the Bill without thinking that by so doing they would raise a storm in municipalities all over the country which they never anticipated, and which would certainly have made them think twice before passing such a proposal as this. He hoped the House would avoid this course by deciding to take these two clauses again into their consideration. After what had been said in the House upon this point he hoped hon. Members would of his proposal.

Mr. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD (Liverpool, West Derby) said that speaking with the experience of a former Chairman of the Liverpool Corporation Tramways, there was no difficulty whatever in an outside company obtaining reasonable powers to run through and right into the centre of a corporation system. It was quite obvious that when these monopolies spread their network all over the country sooner or later the different systems must touch one another and come into contact, as they had come into contact in a great many places in the United Kingdom. In other places, however, the parties had generally been men of common sense, and mutual arrangements had been arrived at. The case which they had now got before the House was one where owing to some fault on one side or the other it had proved impossible to come to any reasonable arrangement. In had been said that a small outside company had no right to send its cars right down into the centre of a populous city, because such a thing would cause a great dislocation of the traffic. He thought that with regard to tramways the centre of Liverpool was probably as difficult to deal with as any other part of the kingdom. He was Lord Mayor of that city last year and he knew that arrangements, had been made by the corporation of Liverpool under which cars coming from Bolton and St. Helens passed right into the centre of Liverpool down to the pier head, and they had experienced no difficulty and no dislocation of traffic at all by this arrangement. He had seen the manager's report upon this arrangement, showing the time table, and the scheme was worked in the simplest manner. The method adopted was as follows:—As soon as a tram car belonging to one of the outside companies reached the Liverpool boundary the driver and conductor got off and the driver and conductor belonging to the municipality of Liverpool got on and took the car to the centre of Liverpool and brought it back again. Each side collected their own fares on their own lines upon their own responsibility and supplied their own power, and the corporation paid one penny a mile for the use of the car. Everybody was satisfied with the arrangement and the passengers had not to get down and change cars, and consequently justice was done all round. [An Hon. Member: Were those compulsory powers?] He could not understand why some simple and reasonable arrangement of that kind was not arrived at in this case. After examining the literature on the subject, he had come to the conclusion that the corporation of Newcastle had absolutely refused on any terms to allow a car of the outside company to cross their boundaries. The outside company were thus bound to come to Parliament for compulsory powers, and the granting of them would not do any harm to the corporation of Newcastle, because the terms would be settled by the Board of Trade if the parties were unable to agree. He wished to add one word about the public convenience. When these monopolies were granted by Parliament they were always granted in the interests of the public, and it was the general public who had a right to be considered first. Wherever they had a break in a tramway system it practically meant a double terminus. The financial effect of a double terminus or a single terminus was that for half-a-mile of line up to the terminus that part did not pay, and the consequence was that in the case under consideration they had a mile of line at each of the three places where the routes met which would be useless and less valuable. He thought that this was clearly one of those cases in which the House ought to support the Committee, and although he had done much to help the municipalities to undertake tramways, he still thought it ought to be recognised that municipalities had no rights which private companies did not also possess. He should, on these grounds, support the Committee, and he trusted that in this matter the House would have regard to the interests of the general public and not yield to this Motion. He noticed that the name of Liverpool was down in the list of municipalities supposed to be supporting this Motion, but he did not believe that Liverpool had anything at all to say in support of this Motion.

Mr. HENDERSON (Durham, Barnard Castle) said the hon. Member representing the Tyneside Division had endeavoured to make out that the application made by this company was supported by the workers in the Tyneside district. The various workers' organisations in the Tyneside district had communicated with him and they had specially urged him to do all that lay in his power to induce the Labour Members in the House of Commons to support the attitude which had been taken up by the corporation of Newcastle upon this question. It had been stated that some 27,000 workers had declared themselves through various channels in favour of this company's proposal, but he did not think anything like that number, if appealed to, could be found to support this Bill. The various trade organisations in Newcastle, Tyneside, and Wallsend were against any such powers being granted to this company. The plea of the company was that they wanted to give the workpeople of Tyneside better facilities for travelling between Newcastle and their employment. He knew the district himself very well, for he had worked there, and he could tell the House that there were thousands of workmen, ratepayers in the city of Newcastle, who were unanimously in favour of the position taken up by the Newcastle Corporation, because they recognised that the corporation had taken in hand a vast property. They felt that any further facilities ought to be granted to the corporation and not to a private company which would enter into competition with the corporation in the management of its own trams. He was very much surprised to find that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade had spoken with two voices. He began his speech by laying it down that the Government were going to be neutral, but he had not travelled very far when he, in the name of the Board of Trade, a Government Department, laid it down that they were going to support wholesale the proposals of the company. The hon. Gentleman went on to make a comparison between the Newcastle case and the case in which the hon. Member for Battersea took an interest, and which came before the House a few weeks ago. The case with which the hon. Member for Battersea was concerned was entirely different from that which the Secretary to the Board of Trade supported now in name of the Board of Trade. Surely there was a difference between the London County Council desiring to extend its own tramway system and trying to link up two parts of this great city, and the case of a corporation which was resisting a private company from the outside when seeking powers to enter a big city like Newcastle-on-Tyne. The analogy, he held, was a most unfair one. But what struck him most of all when the hon. Gentleman was making that comparison was that the Gentlemen who cheered him on the present occasion were the same Gentlemen who opposed the hon. Gentleman for Battersea in the case which he had in hand on behalf of the ratepayers of London a few weeks ago. There was another point which was surprising to him. If the Secretary to the Board of Trade could come and make this pathetic appeal on behalf of the company's proposals this evening, where was he when his right hon. friend the Member for Battersea was trying to do such a great service for the millions of this great city? They had no pathetic appeal from him then on behalf of the London County Council. It appeared that it was only on behalf of a private company that the Board of Trade went out of its way to appeal to this House to go against the wishes of the people of the district. He hoped the Amendment proposed by the hon. Member for Huddersfield would receive the approval of the House. At any rate, the Labour Members were determined to support the Corporation in this matter.

SIR ROBERT HERMON-HODGE (Oxfordshire, Henley) said it might be assumed that he had some particular personal knowledge of the matter before the House, because his name appeared on the Whip which had been issued in favour of the corporation of Newcastle-on-Tyne. He desired to say that his name appeared without his authority. He thought that was a very serious matter, which was worth mentioning to the House.

*SIR JAMES WOODHOUSE: I had nothing whatever to do with that Whip, and I did not issue it

*MR. J. A. PEASE (Essex, Saffron Walden) said if he thought the hon. Member for Barnard Castle was correct in his statement that the working classes in Tyneside were opposed to the tramway facilities being granted, which the company asked for under their Bill, he would certainly vote with him, but having represented the Tyneside Division during the last two Parliaments, and having some knowledge of the question, he took entirely a different view. Let the House realise that the riverside population had doubled in the past ten years, and from the point of view of meeting this increase and the prevention of overcrowding it was essential a linked system be formed between Wallsend and Newcastle. He, at any rate, was consistent in supporting a linked system between areas of population both in London and elsewhere, and he did not understand the view taken which would prevent the facilities being given which were locally required. Not only had the voice of the people been heard that day through their elected Parliamentary representative, but every member elected upon the Wallsend Corporation, the urban district council of Willington Quay, and the urban district of Gosforth had petitioned in favour of the Bill—only those Members had abstained who were shareholders in the company promoting the Bill. The House would therefore see that public opinion in Tyneside as represented by the local authorities was unanimously in favour of the company having running powers into Newcastle, and when they found that the corporation was not prepared to act in a reasonable spirit, there was no other course but to support the Bill.

MR. CORRIE GRANT (Warwickshire, Rugby) said they had to deal here with a mixed question. If this were merely a local matter, he should support the action of the Committee. The company convinced the Committee of the House of Lords, and it obtained the unanimous Vote of the Committee of the House of Commons; but they had in this matter a great contest being fought between municipal enterprise on the one hand and private enterprise on the other. [Cries of "No."] Well, he ventured to think so. They had also what always happened in such contests, namely, private enterprise getting the better. The question the House had to decide was whether they were prepared to establish a precedent that compulsory powers were to be given to a private company over a corporation. The Secretary to the Board of Trade got up and defended the application of the company without having taken the trouble to provide himself with information. He did not make that statement without being prepared to support it. He would ask the hon. Member now whether, before he made his speech, he had read the evidence given before the Commons Committee.

MR. BONAR LAW: Every word of it.

MR. CORRIE GRANT said the hon. Gentleman's second point was that as between private enterprise and municipal enterprise, once powers had been granted they ought to be treated equally. He denied that proposition altogether. Private enterprise and municipal enterprise did not stand on the same basis at all. Private companies thought only of the fares that would make the biggest dividends, and they were right in thinking so. Their business was run as a shop. But municipal enterprise took up a different point of view. They ran their enterprise, not for the purpose of earning profit, but for the purpose of serving the community. This was proved by the fact that in connection with many municipal corporations the charges were diminished when they were earning a large profit in order that they might give more facilities to the community they served. On that account private companies and municipal enterprise should be treated differently. The Newcastle Corporation seemed to have acted blindly in this matter. They ought to have said, "We will not have these compulsory powers at all," and they should have fought the proposal of the company on the Second Reading. Was the House now going to inflict on the whole of the municipal corporations of the country a great wrong? He hoped the House would take a broader view than the Committee had taken and would support the Motion of his hon. friend the Member for Huddersfield.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 142; Noes, 178. (Division List No. 186.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex.F.
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, AugustusHenry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Atkinson, Right Hon. John
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire
Beach, Rt.Hn. SirMichaelHicks
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, RtHn.J.A.(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Davenport, William Bromley-

Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Delany, William
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Greene, Sir E. W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.)
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Rt. Hn. H. (Somers'tE
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Keswick, William
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, William F. Liverpool
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.
Morgan, David J. (Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Percy, Earl
Pierpont, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Pretyman, Ernest George
Price, Robert John
Pryce-Jones, Lt. Col. Edward
Remnant, James Farquharson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Strachey, Sir Edward
Stoyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austen (East Toxteth)
Tennant, Harold John
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Walrond, Rt Hn Sir William H.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Webb, Colonel William George
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. H. C. Smith and Mr. Galloway.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Arrol, Sir William
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bignold, Arthur
Boland, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Richard Knight.
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cullinan, J.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Devlin, Charles Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh)
Dobbie, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duke, Henry Edward
Duncan, J. Hastings
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Farrell, James Patrick
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flower, Sir Ernest
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gardner, Ernest
Gladstone, Rt Hon Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gordon, Hn. J E (Elgin & Nairn)
Grant, Corrie
Guest, Hon. Iver Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Lewis V (Rossendale
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson Arthur (Durham)
Hogg, Lindsay
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordon, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W.
Kilbride, Denis
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lambert, George
Law, Hugh Alex (Donegal, W)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leamy, Edmund
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Lough, Thomas
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Fadden Edward
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Reginald

M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh, N.
Mitchell, William (Burnley)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Joseph, (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary) N.)
O'Doherty, William
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Paulton, James Mellor
Pemberton, John S. G.
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Pym, C. Guy
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renwick, George
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Schwann, Charles E.
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spear, John Ward
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Thornton, Percy M
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wills, Sir Frederick
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir James Woodhouse and Mr. Plummer.

Words added—

Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; Bill re-committed to the former Committee in respect of Clauses 15 and 16.

SUPPLY [15th ALLOTTED DAY].
Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1904–5

CLASS I.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £69,100, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens."

MR. SCOTT-MONTAGU (Hampshire, New Forest) called attention to the regulation under which the motor-car traffic in Hyde Park was restricted to ten miles an hour, and asked the noble Lord the Member for Chorley whether that regulation had been made under the Motor-Car Act, 1903, or under the Parks Regulations Act, 1872. If it had been made under the 1903 Act, then, he contended, the regulation was illegal, inasmuch as the inquiry provided for in that Act had not been held.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) said the regulations which had been issued were not grammatical.

***MR. DISRAELI** (Cheshire, Altrincham) said that in the opinion of a very large number of people motor-cars were entirely out of place in Hyde Park.

And, it being Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

Adjourned at two minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Friday, 1*st July*, 1904.

LORD HENNIKER.

Petition of Charles Henry Chandos Henniker-Major, Baron Henniker in the Peerage of Ireland, claiming a right to vote at the election of Representative Peers for Ireland; read, and referred to the Lord Chancellor to consider and report thereupon to the House.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power Bill [H.L.]. Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [H.L.]. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments (costs awarded), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill [H.L.]. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Doncaster Corporation Bill. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Soothill Nether Urban District Tramways Bill. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

De Trafford Estate Bill [H.L.]. Read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Great Central Railway Bill; Plymouth Corporation Bill. Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Matlock and District Gas Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

Great Northern Railway Bill. Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

London County Council (General Powers) Bill. Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; and referred to the Examiners.

Skipton Water and Improvement Bill. Reported, with Amendments.

Hamilton Gas Order Confirmation Bill. [H.L.]. Read 2ª (according to order).

Govan Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Caledonian Railway Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Glasgow and South Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]. Committee of the Whole House (which stands appointed for this day), put off to Tuesday next.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [H.L.]. Commons Amendments considered (according to order), and agreed to.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

WHALING AND WHALE CURING (SCOTLAND).

Report of a Departmental Committee appointed by the Secretary for Scotland to inquire into the new whaling and whale-curing industry on the coast of Scotland and in the adjacent waters. Vol. I. Report. Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

POST OFFICE (SAVINGS BANK REGULATIONS).

Regulations affecting the transaction of savings bank business at the British Post Office at Constantinople and at Smyrna. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

LIGHT RAILWAYS BILL [H.L.].

Order for the Third Reading on Monday next, discharged.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

NAUTICAL CHARITIES.

LORD MUSKERRY: My Lords, I rise to ask His Majesty's Government whether they would have any objection to furnishing a Return of the various nautical charities existing in the United Kingdom, giving full information as to their administration, the amount of funds at their disposal, how raised and apportioned, the qualifications essential for candidates desirous of obtaining assistance from these charities, and any other information practicable. In putting this Question, I may say that I do so simply because it is believed that certain funds to which our mariners are entitled have fallen into desuetude and are lying idle, when they might be of inestimable benefit to those who follow, or have followed, an arduous and dangerous calling on the high seas, or to those whom they have left behind in poverty or distress, simply because of the hand-to-mouth existence which a sea life means now-a-days. Our nautical charities are so sprinkled and scattered as to render it an almost impossible task for those having no alternative but charity to ascertain where and to whom they may apply. A Return of the kind I suggest would be valuable not only in this, but in bringing before the public many deserving nautical charities which are struggling along and in dire need of that pecuniary assistance which many of our shore-going public might give on knowing the beneficent work they were performing. I have been informed in this House that pensions are granted by the Board of Trade (1) from moneys voted by Parliament to masters who contributed to the Merchant Seamen's Fund previous to August, 1851, and who continued the contribution during the period of their service at sea; (2) from the Greenwich Sixpenny Fund to masters who served at sea for at least five years previous to 1st January, 1835, and who contributed 6d. a month during that period. I fancy that the Board of Trade are not, for instance, overburdened with applications for pensions from masters who have served at sea five years previous to the year 1835, and it is about time that such funds were put to some practical use. A proper Government Return would be of great help in this, and it would be a most useful document for any who are connected with the sea or have a spark of sympathy for the service without which this great Empire could not exist.

LORD WOLVERTON: My Lords, in answer to my noble friend I have to say that the Board of Trade regret that they are not in possession of the information which would enable them to prepare the Return asked for. The Charity Commissioners, with whom the Board of Trade have conferred in the matter, possess information only in regard to the charitable institutions supported by endowments, and these are classified geographically, and not according to the nature of the benefit. It would be possible to prepare a list of the endowed charities in which seamen are entitled to participate, but such a list would be an incomplete one of nautical charities, and the time and labour expended in preparing it would be out of proportion to the result to be obtained.

THE ROYAL DECLARATION AGAINST TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

THE DUKE OF NORFOLK: My Lords, I beg to move the Motion which stands in my name. I do not propose, in doing so, to again go over the reasons which induces me and those who join with me to earnestly appeal to your Lordships' generosity to remove an offensive part from the Royal Declaration. I do not intend to go into all those matters which have stirred our feelings deeply in connection with this subject. They have been sufficiently debated in your Lordships' House already, and I am only too sorry to have to bring the matter up again; but I am afraid it is one of those questions which, until settled, will be always with us, for our religious feelings are wounded in the deepest and most painful way. I fear, however, that I must go a little into the history of the question, because there were certain incidents connected with the treatment of the subject in the session of 1901 and last session which bear upon the general position which it now occupies. Let me at once say that we do appreciate very much indeed the generous feeling we find everywhere that, so far as is possible, this grievance should be set right.

But we are met with a reminder that that generous feeling actually took shape in 1901, that a Committee was then appointed to deal with the problem, that it did deal with it, that it brought forward a modified form of Declaration, one which, in the opinion of those who framed it, ought to have met our demands, and that the attitude we took up on that occasion not only defeated the benevolent intentions of those who were striving to help us, but made it appear hopeless and unnecessary to take any further steps in that direction. It will be remembered that Lord Herries moved for the appointment of a Committee to consider the question; and I wish to quote some words used in the debate, because I think they will tend to remove misapprehension which exists in the minds of some of your Lordships that the Catholic Peers ostentatiously kept away from that Committee. Lord Herries had suggested a doubt whether it was wise that they should be on the Committee, and the late Prime Minister, in moving the appointment of the Committee, said—

"I am rather disposed to agree with the noble Lord (Herries), without being in any way bigoted, that it would be better if the Roman Catholics stood aside from the Committee, and allowed their fellow Peers to judge in this matter, as I think they would be somewhat embarrassed in dealing with it."

What I imagine the noble Marquess had in his mind was that it would be possible for us to accept less if presented by a Committee of which we did not form a part, than we should be justified in accepting if we ourselves were supposed to be the framers of the Motion. That was no doubt what was in the mind of the noble Marquess and it was also what was in our minds, and I think that is an important consideration.

When the statement was made that it might be considered better that noble Lords should be judges of this question without the intervention of Roman Catholic Peers, it never crossed our minds that we were not to be given the opportunity of putting before the judges of this question the reasons why we were anxious that the matter should be dealt with. No effort of any kind, either directly or indirectly, was made to ascertain what the grievances were which the Roman Catholic Peers entertained, and which this Committee was specially appointed to deal with; and, that being the case, I do not think it is very surprising, when we found that the Report of that Committee did not meet the views of those on whose behalf it was appointed, owing to the fact that no attempt to ascertain those views was made, that when it came before your Lordships it was received with very little favour. The most rev. Primate the late Archbishop of Canterbury moved that the Report be referred back to the Committee. Lord Grey spoke strongly on the subject. One or two of his remarks bear out the view I wish to put before your Lordships, and I will read them. Lord Grey, speaking, not of the original Declaration, but of the amended Declaration brought in by the Committee which was intended to solve all our grievances said—

"It offers an unnecessary and gratuitous insult to 12,000,000 of loyal subjects of the King."

A little later the noble Earl said—

"Roman Catholics will realise that the King, in language which can be used by any infidel, is required afresh to repudiate officially and publicly the most sacred doctrine of their religion, and that they are the only sect which are selected for this treatment."

And he went on to say—

"If I were a Roman Catholic, instead of being an ultra-Protestant, as far removed from sympathy with Roman Catholicism as any Member of this House, I think I should prefer to leave the Declaration unamended, and regard it as an archaic and meaningless form, rather than accept this amended Declaration, which will stand forth as the deliberate reaffirmation by Parliament of an anti-Catholic spirit."

I quote that from the speech of Lord Grey, who states that he is as far removed from sympathy with Roman Catholicism as any Member of this House, because, when my noble friend Lord Llandaff made a statement of the same kind, it was seized upon as an argument to show how hopeless it was to meet the views of such retractile people as we were, and that what we wanted was to abolish the Declaration altogether. I quote it to show that it was felt by others as well as by ourselves that this amended Declaration left very much to be desired. It was partly on an argument such as that the Bill was carried through your Lordships' House, but was not sent down to the other House. The Roman Catholic Peers, in difficulty as to how far to support it, felt that it was a well-intentioned effort to meet their wishes, but did not go far enough, and abstained from voting.

The matter rested during the Coronation year, and was brought up again last year, when Lord Grey brought in a Bill for the total abolition of the Declaration. I should like to assure your Lordships that in all we have done as regards moving for an amendment of the Declaration, we have never had it in our minds to get rid of the Declaration altogether, although we have held the belief that it was not necessary, and that the simplest form of dealing with the question would be to abolish it. In the early part of 1901 Lord Grey brought in his Bill, but gave way to Lord Herries, who moved for a Committee. Naturally, when Lord Grey came forward with a Bill to abolish the whole Declaration, we gratefully acknowledged the generous proposal, and gave him all the support we could; but I suggested to him whether it would not be wiser, instead of moving for the abolition of the Declaration, to bring in a Bill to modify it. We have not, as I have said, had it in our mind to abolish the Declaration; we only wish it to be amended.

I now come to the point as to the character of the amendment we desire. What we feel very strongly is that tenets of our faith, so cherished by us and so sacred that it is almost painful that they should be discussed in an Assemblage of this kind at all, should not be required to be publicly repudiated by the Sovereign immediately on his accession to the Throne. At present they are repudiated in a very offensive form. That offensiveness I believe the whole House, with, perhaps, very few exceptions, and I cannot but think the whole country also, is anxious to take away. The object of my Motion is to ask your Lordships to meet us thus far—that while we on our part fully accept the position of the Protestant Succession, while we are fully prepared to stand under the Throne and hear our King assert in as strong language as you wish that he is a Protestant, and, if you like, that he is not a Roman Catholic, we do ask you to stop there and not insist on the King himself having the painful duty of picking out tenets of the faith of the greater part of Christendom throughout the world and publicly repudiating and rejecting them. And we ask this because we do not believe there is any real necessity for it.

The Duke of Norfolk.

We quite feel the justice of what was said by the Archbishop of Canterbury last year that the Coronation Oath did fully safeguard such questions as the maintenance of the reformed religion, but that it was necessary, in addition to that, that the Sovereign should go further and assert that he was himself a Protestant. I am bound to say that as part of the Coronation service is the reception of the Sacrament, I should have thought that assertion was hardly necessary. Still, there is logic in what the most rev. Primate said, that the Sovereign should make it clear and manifest that he is a *bona fide* Protestant and not a Roman Catholic in disguise. To that we quite agree; but we do dissent from the view that it is necessary to repudiate our doctrines in the way in which they are repudiated.

Again I must trouble your Lordships with one or two extracts from the speeches which were made on this subject. Lord Spencer, who was a member of the Committee, speaking in the debate on 8th June, 1901, said that in some ways he differed from the majority of the Committee, but not sufficiently to justify signing a Minority Report. He therefore assented to the general propositions of the Committee; but he used these words—

> "I should have desired that the actual mention of doctrines should have been omitted from this Declaration."

I have alluded to the speech of the most rev. Primate. He stated, as I have just reminded your Lordships, that he did think some assurance was necessary as to the private belief of the King; that is to say, that the King was not merely a man who was minded to keep up the Protestant religion, but was himself a Protestant. But the most rev. Primate expressed the opinion that the matter should be dealt with. He used these words—

> "There is a widespread feeling, not only in this House and in the country, but in the Colonies, that this matter can hardly be allowed to stand indefinitely exactly as it does now."

And a little later on he said—

> "But if it is true, as I think it is true, that some such Declaration is necessary, it surely does not follow that it need be couched in insulting words, and I do not think it need, strictly speaking, denounce anything at all. It seems to me perfectly possible, at least it is not beyond the wit of man, to devise a Declaration which should be mainly positive rather than negative in character and form. I do not believe it is impossible to draw up a Declaration which should avoid not only anything offensive, but anything denunciatory. I trust the matter will not be allowed to rest."

Therefore, I venture to say that there is a widespread feeling everywhere that the matter ought not to be allowed to rest. It appears to me, whether your Lordships accept the Motion which I now move, or whether you accept the Amendment which I see has been placed on the Paper by the noble Earl beside me, Lord Jersey, that it will be necessary that some Committee should be appointed to deal with the matter and to see whether the problem cannot be solved. There are some, I think, including the noble Earl on the Woolsack, and, I think, Lord Rosebery, who have stated that in their opinion it would not be possible to draw up any form of Declaration which did not in some form or other denounce or repudiate certain tenets of our faith. The most rev. Primate the Archbishop of Canterbury has stated that in his opinion it ought not to pass the wit of man to be able to devise some Declaration of the kind. I venture to think, that being the state of the case, that I am justified in calling upon your Lordships to take action of some kind.

I trust the House will see its way to accept the Motion which I have put down, but, at all events, I do hope the issue of this debate will be that some Committee will be appointed to consider the problem; and I do ask, whether Roman Catholics be placed on that Committee or not, that at all events the Committee will not report on our grievances without at least having given us the opportunity of stating fully what our grievances are. They are grievances which, when stated, it may be found impossible to meet; but, at all events, let us bring them before the Committee; let them be fully considered, and let us see whether it is not possible to devise some form of words which shall declare the Protestantism of the King without insulting the faith of so many of his subjects. I really cannot understand why it is that so many people are determined that this latter course must be resorted to. It has been stated that Protestantism is a very negative thing; that you cannot define it. It is almost suggested that the only form of profession of Protestant faith is to denounce and attack the faith held by other people. I can hardly suppose that that is a view which can be supported, and I would quote the opinion of the noble and learned Earl on the Woolsack, who is distinctly of another opinion. The noble and learned Earl said on 8th June, 1901—

> "But can anybody suppose that there is the least doubt as to what the Protestant faith is? I do not mean to say that there are not differences and divergencies in the forms of Protestant profession; but everybody does know, as a matter of fact, the meaning of the Protestant religion, certainly as contrasted with the Roman Catholic faith."

If that is so clear and manifest, is it impossible to devise some form of words which the Monarch can use without specially picking out our doctrine for condemnation? I cannot but think, with the most rev. Primate, that the problem is not beyond the wit of man to solve. If that be so, I would earnestly beg your Lordships to pass this Resolution as an expression of your opinion that, if possible, it ought to be solved. Of course, a Resolution of this House is not an Act of Parliament. It may be that even if your Lordships express that opinion it will be found beyond the wit of man to devise such a form of words. I cannot myself believe that it would be, and I trust that the generous expression of regret at this insult offered to our faith, which we feel, believe me, more deeply than even insulting words to ourselves, will lead to the grievance being taken in hand and dealt with.

I have read the Amendment to be moved by the noble Earl. If he could see his way to move it as a rider to my Resolution I would gladly accept it, for that would bring in what I think many of your Lordships are slow in accepting as our statement that we are perfectly prepared to do nothing which would endanger the Protestant Succession. If the noble Earl will allow that to follow as a rider, and if it is thought that that would make my Resolution more palatable, and that less danger would lurk in it in consequence, I would gladly accept it. The Amendment standing in the name of Lord Stanmore does not carry us any further. I content myself for the present with moving my Resolution, and I trust your Lordships will feel that it is not too much to ask that Parliament should not only relieve us of this sore trial, but also the future Sovereigns of England of what must be to them a most painful, and, as we maintain, a most needless ordeal.

Moved to resolve, "That whereas, under the Bill of Rights and the Act of Settlement, the Sovereign is required to join in Communion with the Church of England as by law established, and ample securities are provided to ensure the Protestant Succession to the Crown; and whereas in addition to these securities, the Sovereign is required, immediately after his Accession, to make a Declaration, commonly called the Declaration against Transubstantiation, which is deeply and needlessly offensive to many millions of loyal subjects of His Majesty, this House is of opinion that the Declaration aforesaid ought to be amended so as not to include the condemnation or repudiation of specific doctrines which form part of the conscientious beliefs of any of His Majesty's subjects."—(*The Duke of Norfolk.*)

*THE EARL OF JERSEY: My Lords, every Member of this House respects the feelings which have caused the noble Duke to bring forward this Resolution. He has addressed us with an earnestness of feeling, and yet at the same time with a moderation of language which will add greatly to the high esteem in which he is already held in this House and in the country. Happily, we live in days when we trust our fellow-subjects, quite irrespective of what their religious beliefs may be. We do not think it necessary to prove our own orthodoxy by insults to those who hold different religious views, and I can assure the noble Duke and those who belong to his Church that I have not put down this Amendment out of hostility or indifference to the feelings of those who are wounded by the words in the Declaration. It would be most repugnant to my own feelings to support words which criticised or cast a stigma upon tenets which are dear to his great Church, and which are held by millions of our fellow-subjects. At the same time I am afraid I must persevere with my Amendment as an Amendment independent of his Resolution.

The noble Duke has alluded to what has taken place in this House during the last three or four years upon this subject. It has been widely debated, as a matter of this importance ought to be, and I think that two points come out clearly—the first, the one to which he has alluded, namely, that there is a desire, a very general, if not a universal desire, on the part of the Members of this House to make alterations in the Declaration which would remove all language which is offensive to Roman Catholics; and the other is that this House has unmistakably shown its intention to maintain a Declaration by the Sovereign when, under the Act of Settlement, he succeeds to the Throne, and one which will be a proof to his subjects that he belongs to the Protestant Faith and to no other. An oath, it is true, may not be an absolute security, but it is a security the importance of which is understood by the person who takes it, and by those before whom it is taken—in this case the nation at large

I respect, and I quite understand, the views of those who, like the noble Duke, object strongly that the dogmas of one religion should be picked out for special repudiation in a Declaration; but I think, my Lords, we cannot approach this subject entirely free from past considerations. The memory of a people is tenacious; causes and events of past times leave their impressions upon succeeding generations long after they have lost their vividness. So it is in the case of this Declaration. Our forefathers struggled with determination to take every human step possible that the successions to the Throne should be Protestant, and to prevent the accession of a Roman Catholic King. They carried out their policy with hardship and with insults, I admit, and I regret it. Those hardships have slowly, perhaps too slowly, been removed, and the insults, I believe, everyone in this House would be only too glad to obliterate; but is it within the range of practical politics to eliminate the language of the Declaration which tries to make it clear that no ruler of this realm shall owe obedience, spiritual or otherwise, to any foreign authority, however venerable, however deservedly respected?

The original framers of this Declaration selected as a test tenets which they apprehended must be held by any Roman Catholic, assuming that if the Sovereign repudiated those tenets he would be repudiating the faith which they dreaded. I have already said they put it into language which we most of us regret, and I have no hesitation also in saying that I trust the opportunity will be taken to remove the most offensive words from the Declaration before circumstances demand them to come into use again. We must recollect also that there are many in this country who have a conscientious objection to waiving in the Declaration taken by the Sovereign the repudiation of the Roman Catholic religion. We, perhaps, in this House can take a wider, a juster, and a more generous view. We can believe, and we do believe, as the noble Duke has said, that the members of his Church have no wish whatever to interfere with the Protestant Succession, but this House does not contain all the intelligence or all the feeling in the country; and I would ask, even if this House decided to make the alteration and to eliminate the words to which objection is taken, does this House think that it will represent the views of the country? I doubt it. But at the same time, I believe it is necessary that a Committee should be appointed to consider this subject, but whether at the present moment it is not, of course, for me to say.

The noble Duke suggests that there should be no condemnation or repudiation of specific doctrines which form part of the conscientious beliefs of any of His Majesty's subjects. Well, if you could strike upon a form of words which would not attack the conscientious opinions of anyone, and whilst exercising this reticence would also safeguard that upon which the nation has hitherto set its mind, it would be a good thing; but I think it would be perhaps unwise for us to say beforehand that we would have no repudiation of any doctrines in the Declaration. But, of course, if a repudiation should be found eventually to be necessary, that could be expressed in terms courteous and respectful to all. I think, though the noble Duke does not quite agree with me, that there lies in the Amendment which I have put down the germs of a decision which will eventually cause, if not full, perhaps some satisfaction, some just satisfaction, to him and his co-religionists. Ask this House to remove any words which will give offence and the response will be favourable, but do not ask this House to go so far as to break entirely with the past. Do not ask it to take a step which might, and which undoubtedly would, be misconstrued in the country. We want to maintain, and we must maintain, every possible guarantee that the Sovereign of this country should belong to the Protestant faith. I think we can do so without casting any reflection or any insults upon those who differ in religion. The Sovereign of this country, it must be remembered, is placed in a political position, and it has been political reasons which have hitherto governed this country in this matter.

I certainly trust, after the debate in your Lordships' House, that there will be a still more generous disposition to come together and try to do everything in our power to relieve those who have hitherto, I quite admit, been allowed to suffer under a grievous wrong and a grievous insult. There is no question of the Church of England. That is protected under the Oath taken at the Coronation. But we have asked, the nation has asked, that their King shall make a clear Declaration, and I, for one, must say that I think we ought to adhere to this demand. The principle running through that Declaration has been asked for by succeeding Parliaments, who have been the representatives of the will of the nation. It has been assented to by a long line of illustrious Sovereigns. Let us try so to word the Declaration that, whilst it will give full confidence to the nation, it will in no wise contain a single expression which could justly offend the feelings of any of the loyal subjects of the Crown in any part of the Empire.

Amendment moved—

"To leave out the words after the word 'That' and to insert the words 'this House, while desirous that no expression unnecessarily offensive to any of his subjects should be required of the Sovereign on His Accession to the Throne, is of opinion that nothing should be done to weaken the security of the Protestant Succession.'"—(*The Earl of Jersey.*)

*THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: My Lords, I do not propose to trespass very long on your Lordships to-night, partly because, mainly because, this time last year when this matter was debated I ventured to state my views on the subject very fully. The noble Duke, in speech the high merit of which has been so well described by the noble Earl who has just sat down, referred to what I said last year, but I am not quite sure that I can accept the quotations by themselves and apart from their context as accurately conveying the opinion I then gave expression to, and to which to-night I desire to adhere. I yield to none in my dislike to any tests that are unnecessary, above all to unnecessary tests of a religious kind which are a bar in any way to civil employment. But there must be, and there are, exceptions to that rule. Take an example from a much lower grade in national responsibility. We have again and again reiterated in this House our view that there is nothing inappropriate in a religious test being applied to a man who has to teach a particular faith so as to show that he holds the faith which he has to inculcate in others.

I think that in the judgment of the whole House it is absolutely necessary that there should be some security given to the nation as a whole as to the attitude which the august personage who occupies the Throne holds towards the faith which is professed by a vast majority of the subjects over whom in the home regions of the Empire he rules. The Declaration which has been commented upon to-night and on previous occasions was, of course, originally imposed for the purpose of securing, in the first instance, that the Sovereign should not be in any way hampered in the discharge of his great duties by allegiance of any kind to an external Power, and further, that he should not be able to throw the weight of his incomparable authority in favour of any change in the national faith. We all agree that those principles have to be secured, and no one has expressed himself more clearly to that effect than the noble Duke himself. There is, therefore, need of a Declaration of some sort; and further, everyone in this House is agreed that such Declaration when made should be drawn so as to give a minimum of pain or disquietude to any citizen or group of citizens in this country, which counts among the proudest of all its boasts the boast of maintaining absolute religious liberty.

Reference has been made to the security given by the Coronation Oath. But note, my Lords, that it is what it professes to be a *Coronation* Oath. Some little time, however, must always elapse between the date of the Accession and the date of the Coronation, nor do I know that there is any constitutional or legal compulsion on the Sovereign to have a Coronation ceremony at all. If that be so, we must beware lest we regard what takes place in that service as in itself adequate for meeting the need which in the opinion of the overwhelming majority of the people of England exists for some security of this kind. Then it was said by the noble Duke that the Declaration might be so altered as to do all it aimed at while avoiding any specific reference to a faith which has to be repudiated.

THE DUKE OF NORFOLK: Specific doctrines.

*THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: While avoiding any reference to specific doctrines which have to be repudiated. Well, my Lords, I should like to see in black and white the Declaration which does that, and which yet meets the difficulties which we are face to face with. Obviously no one now-a-days would choose the epithets to which exception is, I think, most legitimately taken in the Declaration as it now stands. Those epithets belong to a period two centuries ago, when on both sides controversialists were accustomed to be far less sensitive than they are to day to the feelings of those who differed from them. Those epithets belong to a period entirely different from our own, and they are, in

The Earl of Jersey.

the fullest sense of the word, an anachronism to-day. On the other hand, as we have been reminded by the noble Earl who spoke last, we cannot in this matter act as though the history of England 200 years ago had been different from what it was. When King James II. ascended the Throne he took the Coronation Oath in a form not very different from that in which it is taken to-day, and, apart from that, there was the voluntary Declaration on the part of the Sovereign, publicly made to the Privy Council, that—

> "I shall make it my endeavour to preserve this Government both in Church and State as it is now by law established."

It is impossible to forget that those things were said, those sacred promises solemnly made, and that the events of the next few years followed. Without the slightest desire to suggest that history is likely to repeat itself in any such way, we are bound to take care lest we loosen obligations which 200 years ago were found necessary, because the simpler sort of promises had proved incapable of resisting the strain put upon them.

It is our duty to take heed how we weaken a Declaration which, however painful and offensive in its outward form, is yet in its practical bearing universally admitted to be incapable to-day of giving way after the fashion in which the simpler promises yielded to strain 200 years ago. We have to beware lest in the desire to be kindly and conciliatory in language we do anything to weaken the effectiveness of the Declaration. I stated in the former debate, and the noble Duke has quoted what I said, that possibly words of a merely positive sort, with a complete absence of denunciation, or even of repudiation, might be devised. I am bound to admit that subsequent communications I have had upon this matter make me feel less sanguine than I was as to the practicability of devising such words so as to meet the demands of all those concerned. It does not seem to me that repudiation need necessarily contain anything whatever of insult or anything which could legitimately cause offence, but repudiation of some kind I have come to think is absolutely necessary if the Declaration made is to hold the character we all desire that it should hold of an effective and really binding sort so as to be acceptable to Englishmen generally.

But, my Lords, I feel that in this matter we are absolutely bound to throw the responsibility on the Government of the day and to leave the responsibility there. It is for that reason that I feel more than a difficulty as to the words of the noble Duke's own proposal. He desires that something shall be done to bring about an amelioration of the existing tension, for it is nothing less, on this subject, but in stating how it is to be done the noble Duke seems to me to go somewhat further than it is necessary to go when he lays down specifically the character of the Declaration which should be devised. The noble Duke says that it is to be done by a Declaration which must have a definite and specific character which he describes. It does not seem to me that we need go into such detail as that when we are expressing our desire that some modification of that Declaration may now or hereafter be made which shall meet the difficulties while retaining its effectiveness and its power. If the noble Duke will show us—and if His Majesty's Government will take in hand the task of giving effect to what he has shown — how a new Declaration can be framed in the way he desires, I for one shall welcome it, and feel that we have done the right thing, supposing always we retain the effectiveness while altering the form. But at present I fail to understand how this can be done, if repudiation of doctrine forms no part of the document. I, therefore, feel that our business is to leave upon the Executive Government of the day the responsibility of dealing with what I admit to be a grave difficulty. It is for them to say in what way, and by what means, the modification can be brought about which we all wish to see effected in the Declaration taken by the Sovereign at an hour when we desire, above all other times, that we shall as far as possible be of one heart and one mind in giving a welcome to him who is to rule over the country.

*EARL COWPER: My Lords, I wish to say a few words on this question. It seems to me that the objection to the Motion of the noble Duke is that we do not wish to pledge ourselves not to insist upon distinct repudiation of certain doctrines which are held by the

Church of Rome. There is no doubt we have been told by those who represent the Roman Catholics in this House that they do object to this distinct repudiation of their doctrines, that it wounds their feelings, and that they consider it most objectionable, and will not be satisfied with anything except doing away with it. It seems to me that our discussion is merely between this and a simple affirmation that the Sovereign is in favour of the Protestant religion. If this is really true, I do not deny that I myself would recommend that we should be content with this simple affirmation. It will satisfy the people of England that the King intends to be a Protestant, and that is all we can hope for as to any security this Declaration may give us against having a Catholic Sovereign. What now, for instance, is our danger, if there is any? If the heir to the Throne happened to be brought up as a Catholic, known to be one, and the whole country felt that as soon as he ascended the Throne he would throw his whole weight in that direction, there would be such a rising among the people, such a strong feeling, such a violent Protestant outbreak, that there would be no chance whatever of such a man succeeding to the Throne. The laws would be put in force, and if there was any danger of the laws not being sufficiently strong, new ones would be enacted. This is not the danger we have to fear; I do not deny that there is some slight danger, but not in that direction. There is no doubt that during our life-time there has been a pretty strong current in favour of conversion to the Church of Rome. It is, I am happy to say, less strong now than it was some years ago, but it is not yet spent. These conversions, as you know, have chiefly taken place in the upper classes, among families where you would least expect it. You have no guarantee that what has operated on so many others may not operate on the Royal family. We have no certainty that even the occupant of the Throne may not become converted to that Church.

There is, I am happy to say, no tendency whatever, so far as I can see, of any present member of the Royal family taking that line, but we do not know what may happen in another generation. These conversions just as often as not take place in middle and later life, and many of these men, long after they had reached years of discretion, would have been most happy to have taken this Declaration against transubstantiation and everything else. We have no security whatever against the danger which I have mentioned, which is the only one I can see any possibility of. If, therefore, this Declaration is not by any means a certain and sure guarantee that we shall have a Protestant Sovereign, then I maintain we have no right to hurt people's feelings unnecessarily in order to cause it to be made. Therefore, I cannot help feeling that it would be quite sufficient to calm the feelings of the people of this country and satisfy sensitive consciences, if the Sovereign in some form or other declared that he is in favour of the maintenance of the Protestant religion.

I think we all feel that the English Catholics are not people who ought to be unnecessarily wounded and offended. They are among the most loyal of British subjects. They have shown themselves in time of danger and difficulty as ready as any of our fellow-Protestants to come forward to give their money and risk their lives for their country. We many of us most fully incline not only to take away those most offensive words which are used now, and which everybody is in favour of removing, but even to take away, if necessary, this formal repudiation of doctrines which they hold so dear. I have not before spoken on this matter, and I beg to say that I shall have the greatest pleasure in voting for the Motion submitted by the noble Duke.

*THE MARQUESS OF RIPON: My Lords, I gave way to my noble relative and I am very glad I did so, because we have had from Earl Cowper an important declaration in favour of the Motion moved by the noble Duke. The Roman Catholic Members of this House are in regard to this question in a special position, and, as one of them, I rise for the purpose of expressing freely my own opinions. Those opinions may not be shared by others who do not belong to the Roman Catholic Church, but I am speaking for myself alone, and I wish to exercise, therefore, complete freedom in what I desire to submit to your Lordships. In one respect, at all events, I agree with what fell from the most rev. Primate. This question, of course, involving considerations of a constitutional character and great fundamental constitutional statutes, can only be really and effectively dealt with by the Government. All that can be done until they deal with the question is that Parliament should, as far as it can, express its own views in regard to the matter.

Now, my Lords, as far as my own individual opinion is concerned, I place no faith whatever in Declarations of this kind. I believe that bad men will take as many of them as you like to put before them, and that good men will be controlled, and much better controlled, by the most simple expressions that can be found. But, my Lords, that is not the position which I desire to take up as a Roman Catholic Member of this House. I do not ask your Lordships to have no Declaration at all. I believe that there is truth in what has been said by others already in this discussion, that a great amount of importance is attached, I think erroneously, to some Declaration of this kind; and, therefore, in full accordance with the Motion made by my noble friend opposite, I think it would be wise, in the interests of the Roman Catholic body, that a Declaration of a fitting sort should be retained. There is nothing, I think, of greater interest to the Roman Catholic people of this country than that there should be no suspicion that we have the slightest desire to interfere with the Protestant Succession. That Succession has, as the most rev. Primate has reminded us, been in existence for more than two centuries, and nothing could be more unwise than that a limited body like the Catholics should set themselves against what I believe to be the deliberate opinion of the people of this country.

The people of this country are in the majority Protestants, and if they think it important to their interests, their religious or their secular interests, that their Sovereign should be of the same creed, I am not here for a moment to gainsay their right to require that that should be the case. That opinion is not a new one in history. It was the opinion which animated the League in France in the 16th century when they refused to acknowledge Henri IV. until he had been reconciled to the Catholic Church. That being the view of the majority of the people of this country, I think it is right and proper that their wishes in regard to the matter should prevail, and certainly the worst thing that could happen in the interests of the Roman Catholic portion of the population would be that any change should be attempted to be made in the substantial provision for the Protestant Succession. But I ventre to submit that the Declaration in its present form gives no more real additional security than would be given by a moderate Declaration such as nobody in this House or out of it doubts would be drawn up at the present time if the question were now to be raised in the first instance. It seems to me, from what has already been said in this discussion, that there is a general feeling—I had almost said a universal feeling—in this House that the language in this Declaration which is offensive to Roman Catholics should be got rid of, but we seem to be impotent with regard to the matter. If you wish to get rid of those words, surely it is not beyond the wit of man to devise some Declaration which, while it would give such security as a Declaration of that sort is supposed to be able to give, would at least not inflict upon the King's Roman Catholic subjects the pain of hearing from the Throne a Declaration having words in it which are insulting to the Roman Catholic faith.

I hope, my Lords, that we shall hear something of a more definite and distinct kind in regard to the views of His Majesty's Government on this matter. I have little quarrel with the Amendment of my noble friend opposite. He supported it in a speech marked by the ability and moderation which always distinguish him, but I confess I am unable to see what advantage will be gained in regard to this matter by passing my noble friend's Amendment. My noble friend makes two statements. He states his desire to get rid of the words in the Declaration which are offensive to Roman Catholics, and he expresses his desire to do nothing which would weaken the security of the Protestant Succession. I agree with him. But he makes those two statements by way of preface, and then he stops short. He draws no conclusion. How is my noble friend going to get rid of the offensive words of this Declaration unless by having the Declaration altered;

and does my noble friend mean to say there is no possible means by which this Declaration could be altered, so as to remove from it its offensive character as regards Roman Catholics, and at the same time to retain every security for the Protestant Succession? I cannot think that is impossible. I, therefore, feel the greatest hope that we shall have some sort of assurance such, for instance, as will be conveyed by the adoption of the Amendment of Lord Stanmore, that this question will be fully and deliberately considered.

When this Declaration was first introduced to be taken by the Sovereign, it was already taken by a great many persons in the country, by a previous Act of Charles II., but it was applied to the person of the Sovereign in days immediately succeeding to the Declaration—that untruthful Declaration—which was made by James II., and to which the most rev. Primate has alluded. It is, therefore, not very surprising that, if our ancestors at that time thought that by heaping up words they would give greater security to themselves in regard to this matter, they should have taken that course. But, my Lords, I venture to say that it is perfectly futile. As I said just now, a bad man—Charles II., for instance—would have taken twenty such Declarations, and, if I may use the expression, would have made no bones about it; but a good man would only be troubled in his conscience by this heaping up of words, and you have in reality no necessity for them. If you want a Declaration, have a Declaration; but you have no necessity whatever for making it of a character which is insulting towards a large portion of His Majesty's subjects.

This Declaration I venture to say must be amended. I am not now speaking of it as it affects the Roman Catholic body; but there is language in it which the Sovereign is obliged to declare, and which I heard our present Gracious Sovereign declare from the Throne, which, in my judgment, and I think it must be so in the judgment of every one of your Lordships, is a gross insult upon the King. After the experience of James II. and of others of the House of Stuart, for they were not a truthful family, it was perhaps not unnatural that Parliament should have tried to tie them up in this manner; but, my Lords, we all feel very differently towards the Royal family under whom we now have the happiness to live. We all know that there is no shadow of dishonesty, no chance of untruthfulness, with regard to them; and surely, that being the case, it is highly improper that we should force the Sovereign when he opens his first Parliament, at one of the most interesting and important periods of his reign, to use these words. I am almost ashamed, my Lords, to read them, but for the purpose of this argument it is necessary—

> "And I doe solemnely in the presence of God professe, testifie, and declare that I doe make this declaration and every part thereof in the plaine and ordinary sence of the words read unto me as they are commonly understood by English Protestants without any evasion, equivocation, or mentall reservation whatsoever, and without any dispensation already granted me for this purpose by the Pope or any other authority or person whatsoever, or without any hope of such dispensation from any person or authority whatsoever, or without thinking that I am or can be acquitted before God or man, or absolved of this declaration or any part thereof, although the Pope or any other person or persons or power whatsoever should dispense with or annull the same, or declare that it was null and void from the beginning."

My Lords, those are the words of men who distrust their Sovereign. We do not distrust our Sovereign. We are animated towards him by the warmest feelings of loyalty, and I do say that it is most unbecoming that a new Sovereign should be required to use words of such a description, implying such distrust, on the first occasion that he meets his Parliament. Unfortunately, this is a matter in which it is dangerous to wait. We all hope that the life of King Edward VII. may be greatly prolonged. Already during his short reign he has given us many occasions and many reasons for gratitude. We are bound to him by every tie of attachment and respect. But, my Lords, all human life is uncertain. If a demise of the Crown takes place there is no help; the Declaration must be taken, because you cannot at that time alter the law. Therefore, my Lords, I do submit that in whatever form it be, by whatever means it is brought about, you must in that respect at least alter this Declaration before the Crown becomes vacant; and if you are going to touch it at all, I am confident there is no Peer among your Lordships who would consent to leave those words, which are insulting to Roman Catholics, in an altered Declaration.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of LANSDOWNE): My Lords, I think it may be convenient to your Lordships that before the debate proceeds further something should be said from this Bench as to the manner in which His Majesty's Government regard the Motions which are before your Lordships' House; and I am the more impelled to make such a statement because both the most rev. Primate and the noble Marquess opposite made in the course of their speeches a direct appeal to His Majesty's Government for information as to the manner in which they propose to deal with this most important question. I take it that I shall not be contradicted if I say that in all parts of the House there is a widespread and earnest desire that this question should be settled in a reasonable and temperate manner. Indeed, we can scarcely do otherwise than look back with mortification at what the noble Marquess, I think, called our impotence to deal with this problem. We feel that it is deplorable that this grievance should remain rankling in the minds of the Roman Catholic subjects of the King, and it is particularly deplorable that at the time of the accession of the Sovereign, when men's thoughts are full of loyalty, and hope, and patriotism, their feelings should be distracted and tortured by the kind of doubts to which this question has given rise.

The noble Marquess has stated that His Majesty's Government should deal with the matter themselves. I am almost tempted to reply that the noble Marquess somewhat over-rates the power of the Government of the day to dispose of a question so much controverted as this. The Government of the day is not in the position of a superior authority imposing terms upon two reluctant disputants. There are limitations upon our powers of even suggesting terms to them. Those limitations, to my mind, are in in two directions. In the first place, it is impossible for us to put forward any settlement which is disapproved of by the great body of our Protestant fellow-subjects. I assure the noble Marquess that we deeply appreciate the feelings which he has expressed on behalf of his co-religionists, but the feelings of he Protestant community are not less deep-seated; and no Government, however strong, could trifle with those feelings or force upon the Protestant people of this country a settlement of which in their hearts they disapproved. That is one limitation upon our power to solve the problem; but, my Lords, there is another. I do not believe any Government will find it possible to effect a settlement of this question unless the leaders of public opinion on both sides are able to show us that they have arrived, of their own accord, at the basis of a settlement. It does not seem to me that it is for the Government to discover, still less to dictate, the terms of a compromise; but I do think it is for those who, either on behalf of the Protestant or of the Roman Catholic community, come forward as the leaders of public opinion, to show that they are at any rate within a measurable distance of an agreement on this question.

I ask your Lordships whether, up to the present time, evidence has been forthcoming to show that we are near enough to such an agreement to admit of a hope that it may be brought about? The history of these discussions is recent in your Lordships' minds. We have not forgotten the abortive attempts at legislation that took place in the year 1901; they were to many of us grievously disappointing. In the earlier stages of this discussion it certainly seemed that we were not very far apart. The Protestant community readily admitted that the Declaration was offensive and needed amendment. Roman Catholics, on their side, freely admitted their readiness to maintain the Protestant Succession. Well, your Lordships recollect what happened. We introduced a Bill containing an amended Declaration. The noble Marquess who spoke last read to your Lordships those parts of the Declaration which seemed most offensive to him and his co-religionists.

THE MARQUESS OF RIPON: I beg my noble friend's pardon. I read the parts which related to the King. I did not read a word of the part which relates to Roman Catholics.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: The noble Marquess read with great emphasis a long passage comprising fully one-half of the Declaration.

THE MARQUESS OF RIPON: But not the part relating to Roman Catholics.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: What I wish to impress upon the House is, that in our Bill of 1901 the passages which the noble Marquess read were expunged from the Declaration which we proposed to your Lordships. Your Lordships recollect the course of the debate that then took place. It became apparent that our proposal, which was criticised by our Protestant friends, was not acceptable to the Roman Catholic Peers, nor indeed to many other Peers. It is quite true, as the noble Duke reminded the House, that Lord Grey, as well as Lord Llandaff, took exception to the terms of the amended Declaration; but there was this that was remarkable in their criticism of it, that they gave us distinctly to understand that they infinitely preferred to keep the old unamended offensive Declaration rather than to substitute for it what I think the noble Lord called a "milk and water" Declaration fortified by the sanction of recent legislation. Well, my Lords, we made our attempt, and in the face of criticism of that kind we had no choice but to abandon it. We naturally ask ourselves whether this evening's discussion has brought us any nearer to an agreement. I listened attentively to the speech of the noble mover, and I ask permission to associate myself with those who have commended the noble Duke for the tone and temper by which his remarks were characterised.

The noble Duke made, I thought, some very important admissions. He told your Lordships that in his view it was reasonable to retain a Declaration, that it must be one which would be effectual for the maintenance of the Protestant Succession, and I think I understood him to add that it must be drawn in terms which would make it perfectly clear that the Sovereign not only was to be a Protestant, but that he was not to be a Roman Catholic. Well, my Lords, I welcome the feelings which led the noble Duke to make that overture to us; but I am obliged to look at the terms of the Resolution he has placed on the Paper, and I observe it is for him a *sine qua non* that the amended Declaration shall not include the repudiation of any specific doctrine which forms part of the conscientious belief of any of His Majesty's subjects. Now, my Lords, we have to consider what kind of a Declaration that would be in which no repudiation found any place at all. I am one of those who believe—I regret to have to say it—that if we are to have a Declaration, and it is to be an effectual Declaration, it is impossible to avoid in some shape or form a repudiation of certain doctrines. Without such repudiation it seems to me the Declaration would be little more than a feeble echo of the Coronation Oath. In these circumstances is the offer which the noble Duke makes to us—that is, of a Declaration without the language which, in the view of many of us, must contribute to make it effectual—is that an offer which we are able to accept? I fear that I must answer that question in the negative, and that I must say that those who sit near me prefer to vote for the Amendment of the noble Earl. The noble Earl's Amendment came in for criticism on the part of the noble Marquess. He suggested to your Lordships, in effect, that it was little more than a platitude, and that it required some operative words at the end to give it any importance. I do not agree with that. It seems to me that the Amendment of the noble Earl emphasises what we have already affirmed by our attempt at legislation in 1901, our desire to expunge from the Declaration any words which give needless offence to our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen. That was our feeling in 1901, and it is our feeling now.

But the real question is whether we can go a little further, and whether the time has come for re-opening the investigation of this question, and accepting the suggestion which will be made later in the evening to your Lordships by the noble Lord on the Cross Benches of the appointment of a Committee. I am aware that the Committee of 1901 appeared to many of your Lordships an unsatisfactory and inconclusive inquiry. My impression is that the Committee was given a mandate by this House, and that it carried out its mandate faithfully and conscientiously; but when I say that, I do not suggest that I cannot conceive of an inquiry which might be fuller and more convincing in its results, and which might during its course elicit, to an extent to which the Committee of 1901 did not elicit, the opinion of Roman Catholic Peers. But again I ask the House whether we shall be well advised to embark upon such an inquiry, unless we could arrive more near an understanding than I am afraid has yet been the case. What I am afraid of is this, that what might be called a fishing inquiry would not only not lead to any result, but might have the effect of further accentuating the differences to which we all desire to give as little prominence as possible. But, my Lords, while we do not see our way this evening to vote for the appointment of a Committee, I am certainly inclined to say that if, as the result of those less formal communications which are so easily made between parties who do not agree in opinion, it should prove to be the case that there really is a common ground upon which such an inquiry can proceed, then we should certainly be glad to see such an inquiry instituted; and all I can say is that if that happy condition of things should arise, no Members of your Lordships' House would be better pleased than His Majesty's Government to see a satisfactory and friendly termination of a difference which we all sincerely regret, and which we all sincerely desire to see removed.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: My Lords, I also desire, on behalf of my noble friends who sit on this Bench, to associate myself with what has been said with regard to the speech of the noble Duke who introduced this Motion. We all of us, I think, sympathise with the motives which induced him to re-open this question, and our sympathy was increased by the form and manner of his speech. The noble Duke did not show the slightest trace of bitterness, when some little bitterness would have been, in the opinion of many of us, quite excusable. The noble Duke and the noble Marquess who has just sat down both alluded to the abortive Committee and the abortive attempt at legislation of 1901. The failure of that Committee to reach a conclusion satisfactory to your Lordships was, as a matter of fact, due to a misunderstanding, possibly on the part of the Committee, but also on the part of some Members of your Lordships' House.

When the subject was first raised in March of that year by my noble friend Lord Herries the terms which he employed in his speech led us to suppose that the exception which was taken by Roman Catholic Peers to the Declaration rested mainly upon what Lord Salisbury very properly called the "language of indecent violence" which is to be found in it; and when Lord Herries, in that speech, used the phrase that the desire of Roman Catholics was that the offensive words should be removed, we, the Members of the Committee, understood that it was to the terms of violence that the expression was applied and not to the repudiation of any particular doctrine. It may have been our fault, but I think other members of the Committee will bear me out when I say that it never occurred to those of us who served on the Committee at that time that anything more was demanded of us than the deletion of those particularly offensive expressions.

Now, the issue is a perfectly clear one. It is at any rate admitted by noble Lords who are Roman Catholics that a Declara- of some kind may be necessary, and the one point at issue is whether that Declaration should contain a specific repudiation of one or two particular Roman Catholic doctrines, or whether no repudiation should appear in it at all. I confess that I am disposed to agree with noble Lords who think it may be found exceedingly difficult to arrive at a form which will stamp the Sovereign as a Protestant without some words of repudiation. What, my Lords, is the definition of a Protestant? A Protestant, I suppose, would describe himself as a member of the Catholic Church who repudiates or protests against certain doctrines which he considers to be accretions upon the Catholic faith; and how, without naming what those accretions are, he can justify his name of Protestant is to me a question of some difficulty. But I do most freely agree that if a form of words could be found which would satisfy ordinary public opinion—I will not say extreme Protestant opinion, but ordinary public opinion—that the Protestant character of the Sovereign was safeguarded by them, I should certainly say that those terms ought to receive the closest consideration from your Lordships' House.

And then the question which the noble Marquess has dealt with arises, how are any further proceedings to be taken in this matter? The noble Marquess gave reasons against the appointment of a Committee to deal with the subject. Well, I am inclined to agree with what fell from my noble friend behind me, that it would be better if His Majesty's Government would undertake the task themselves. They are in a position to obtain the best expert opinion on the subject, they can receive representations from Roman Catholic Peers and from other noble Lords, and from all other persons who are interested in this matter to an extent which I think it would be somewhat difficult for a Committee of your Lordships' House to do. If a Committee were to allow general evidence from religious bodies of all kinds, I fear it would find its task not merely long and troublesome, but also of a kind which would be likely to stir up a good deal of ill-feeling in the country. I should have thought it would have been possible for His Majesty's Government, working, so to speak, behind the scenes, to receive the matured opinions of those most qualified to speak on behalf of different religious bodies, and they would then be able to come down to the House and tell us whether they had been able to get over this particular difficulty of the form of words, and whether they had found it possible to devise some means of ensuring the Protestant character of the Declaration without including the repudiation of different doctrines. It is impossible for us to support the Motion of the noble Duke as it stands; but if he will agree to strike out the last few words of it, stopping at the word "amended" in the third line from the bottom, it appears to me that the Motion might then well appear upon the Journals of your Lordships House, and it would be an encouragement to the Government to proceed with the matter. I may point out that by the omission of the words after "amended" the Motion does not bind your Lordships House either one way or the other, either to include or to strike out the repudiation of specific doctrines.

THE LORD BISHOP OF BRISTOL: My Lords, I desire to put before your Lordships a consideration to which no reference has been made, and to make an appeal in the interests of persons whose sensitiveness has been, and is, very seriously wounded. But first, I should like to say a word on another point. Those who know the history of the language of the time are perfectly aware that the word Protestant is a positive and not a negative term. The authorised version of the scriptures makes that perfectly clear. The same statement is true when you look back to the history of the word. In a catechism of 743, the curious question is put, "What is the value of the proposal," to certain persons named? The answer is, "the power of protesting," and it may interest your Lordships to know that the Bishop's power of protest was worth that of 240 ordinary taxpayers. In the actual wording of the Bill of Rights and the Act of Settlement there is no sort of antithesis between Protestant and Catholic. Your Lordships are perfectly aware that Protestant as an adjective is in antithesis to Popish, and Protestant as a substantive is in antithesis to the Papacy.

But I wish to make an appeal in the interests of those whose sensitiveness has been and is being very seriously wounded —I need hardly say that I mean the members of the Church of England. There are two sides to this question. I sympathise most heartily with the noble Duke and all of his communion in this House, and I shall be very glad indeed if, in the ripeness of time to which the noble Marquess at the head of His Majesty's Government has referred, we could, with one accord, join in getting rid of the objectionable words in the Declaration. But there is another side to the question. We of the Church of England are under the ban of the spiritual sovereign of the other communion; I am assured that all of us are excommunicated. Do your Lordships know what this means? I will read the actual phrase printed in a London newspaper at the time of the death of Archbishop Benson. I apologise to the noble Duke and to the noble Marquess opposite by name, and to all Members of your Lordships' House for having to read such a sentence from the gutter Press of the time—

> "An old heretic absolutely hung round with a catena of interdicts and excommunications, whose sole hope of salvation rests upon a miraculous and invincible ignorance of God's truth."

Then, again, as a Bishop and priest of the Church of England, I am told by the spiritual sovereign of that communion, and in our own generation, that my orders are invalid; that the members of the Church of England have not been rightly confirmed, nor have ever received the Holy Eucharist, and, from the Sovereign downwards, we are all excommunicate and withwithout sacraments. I say that my whole soul revolts against that most terrible statement as being as insulting to me as anything complained of by the noble Duke can possibly be insulting to the members of his faith.

One more example. Take the case of mixed marriages. In our own generation there has been a serious change made in this matter. I remember the time when, if a Roman Catholic married one of our Church, they went naturally to both Churches; the sons were brought up in the religion of the father, and the girls in the religion of the mother. All that has been changed, and now if a Roman Catholic marries a member of the Church of England he is absolutely forbidden—so I am told by the highest authority—to enter the Church of the other partner, even if for the comfort of that other partner, and to receive the blessings of the Church on the union. I am also told that the requirement now made is that all the children born of such marriages shall be brought up in the Roman Catholic communion. I say, my Lords, that I should be thankful to take part in the ripeness of time in removing the words complained of in the Declaration, but I do say this, that if the time is to become ripe we must bear in mind not only the very sensitive people who feel sensitive, but that we should ask in their sensitiveness whether some regard should not be paid to the sensitiveness of other persons. As far as hardship and insult are concerned, I believe that the Protestants are the aggrieved persons, and it is not from them that any relaxation in the direction indicated should at first come.

Lord HERRIES: My Lords, I should like to say a few words with regard to what has just fallen from the right rev. Prelate. I think he introduced into the few remarks he made to your Lordships matters which are hardly relevant to the question before us. If I was asked to pass an opinion, I should say that I consider he is quite safe, because he is evidently convincingly ignorant. The question before us is, What are we to do in the circumstances in which we are at present? I think we may be satisfied that almost the whole of your Lordships are in favour of some amendment of the Royal Declaration. The only question before us is how far it should be amended, and here I would like to say that I think the noble Marquess the Leader of your Lordships' House is under some slight misconception as to the attitude which was taken up by the Catholic Members of this House when the Bill was brought before your Lordships which proposed to amend the Royal Declaration. Not a single Roman Catholic Peer voted against the Second Reading of that Bill. It is quite true that we complained that our articles of belief were inserted against our approval, but we did not oppose the Second Reading; and, as far I am individually concerned, I should have preferred that the Bill had passed and that the Royal Declaration had been amended in that form than that it should remain as at present. I do not think it is fair to say that we were so hostile to the Bill that it was evident it could not be proceeded with.

I would like to refer to a speech made ninety years ago which, I think, meets the case in point, because we are told that it is absolutely necessary that certain specific doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church should be condemned in order that the public might be sure that the King was a Protestant. The words I would quote were by Mr. Canning. I do not think anyone will consider that Mr. Canning was in any way inclined to the Roman Catholic religion. In 1813 Mr. Canning said that to continue these enactments against transubstantiation when it was no longer, as it once was, a symbol of dangerous politics, was as absurd as that of having had occasion to advertise a runaway felon and to describe him by his red hair, you should for all time characterise red hair as a crime. The Protestant Succession is sufficiently secured without any condemnation of this sort.

After the speeches we have heard to-day I must say I am rather inclined to assent to what has been proposed by my noble friend Lord Crewe, namely, that the noble Duke should leave out the words after "amended" and be satisfied if the House would adopt his Resolution down to that word; and if, after this, your Lordships would go further and agree to the Amendment which is to be moved by the noble Lord on the Cross Benches, Lord Stanmore, I think the end which we have in view, which is that this matter should be further considered, will be attained. I have risen for the purpose of appealing to the noble Duke to be content with moving his Resolution down to the words "shall be amended," and to appeal to your Lordships to agree to the proposal to be submitted by Lord Stanmore, so as to secure the appointment of a Committee to consider this matter.

THE DUKE OF NORFOLK: My Lords, after the expressions of opinion we have heard I think it is clear that the vast majority of your Lordships do feel that a change must be carried out. The Government shrink from the responsibility of doing it, but hope people in private may mature things so that some action on their part might become more possible than the noble Marquess regards it at present. I do not know how my noble friend Lord Jersey would regard the Motion if I accepted the suggestion to leave out all the words after the word "amended," and whether he would then withdraw his Amendment. I feel the justice of what Lord Jersey said. He said, in effect, "We all wish to amend this. Why do you insist on committing us to the statement that nothing will be accepted which includes the condemnation or repudiation of specific doctrines? Why not leave it to a Committee to deal with the matter?" I feel the force of that, and therefore I do not wish to press my Motion to a division and try to commit your Lordships—partly because I think it is clear you are determined not to be committed—to the statement in the latter part of my Motion. I do not know what position Lord Jersey would take up if I accepted the suggestion which has been thrown out by Lord Crewe.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of HALSBURY): My Lords, I intervene only for a moment to deprecate the alteration of Motions by suggestions made across the floor of the House, the full effect of which may not be immediately apparent. The suggestion is that all which appears in the earlier part of the Motion should be retained, and only the last three lines omitted. It will be observed that in the earlier part of the Motion it is stated that—

> "Whereas, in addition to these securities, the Sovereign is required, immediately after his accession, to make a Declaration, commonly called the Declaration against Transubstantiation, which is deeply and needlessly offensive to many millions of loyal subjects of His Majesty, this House is of opinion that the Declaration aforesaid ought to be amended."

I am quite sure that I speak truly the feeling of a great number of our Protestant fellow-subjects when I say that any amendment which would negative the positive disavowal of the Roman Catholic faith would be what this country would not accept, and acceptance of this suggested Amendment would be an assumption by your Lordships that that is what the country would accept. What the Protestant people of this country desire is that there should be a Declaration such as no honest person could take if he were a Roman Catholic, and which therefore forms an additional security for the Protestant Succession. I do not wish to go into what happened on the previous occasion, but I think Lord Herries is a little mistaken in regard to what took place in connection with the abandonment of the Bill by His Majesty's Government. My noble friend Lord Llandaff expressly stated, and his statement was not repudiated by anybody at the time, that he would prefer that the coarse and violent language in which the Declaration was contained should be retained than that it should be so amended that it should still retain the power of repudiating doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church; and it was upon that that my noble friend the late Lord Salisbury stated that it was impossible for His Majesty's Government, in the circumstances, to endeavour to pass the Bill. It appears to me that the acceptance of a new form of Motion to-day would be dangerous, and I hope your Lordships will not acquiesce in any such course.

THE DUKE OF NORFOLK: My Lords, as I have already stated, I am prepared to withdraw my Motion in favour of the Amendment of the Earl of Jersey. It reaffirms the opinion of your Lordships' House that the Declaration ought to be amended, and I trust that it will be followed by the acceptance of Lord Stanmore's Motion, and that the Government will appoint a Committee.

On Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Motion," resolved in the negative.

Words inserted.

Resolution, as amended, agreed to.

*LORD STANMORE: My Lords, I now rise to move the Amendment of which I have given notice, namely, that a Select Committee be appointed to consider whether any unnecessarily offensive words may not be expunged from the Declaration without incurring the danger contemplated. My Motion as it appears to me, is the only logical and reasonable complement and fulfilment of the Resolution which the House has just adopted. That Resolution contains two propositions, the one that the King's Declaration made upon his accession ought not to contain words unnecessarily offensive; the other that nothing should be done to impair the security of the Protestant Succession to the Crown. But there the Resolution stops. The only logical conclusion to it is to attempt to find some mode of reconciling the two propositions there put forward. That task I believe to be not impossible, and easier, instead of more difficult, now than it was a year ago.

The noble Earl who moved the Resolution which has now been adopted, said, among other things, that it was not for him to say whether this was or was not the time suitable for appointing a Committee of Investigation. Why not, I should like to know. The noble Earl is as independent a Member of your Lordships' House as any noble Lord present, and it is surely as open to him as it is to any other of your Lordships to say whether in his opinion the formation of a Committee to discuss this question is desirable or undesirable. I cannot conceive why he should leave that point without an expression of opinion of his own. But, however that may be, we have advanced, I think, some way towards agreement. The offensiveness of certain of the expressions used in the King's Declaration is admitted generally by Members on both sides of the House and of all shades of opinion. On the other hand, the opinion of the House that nothing should be done to impair the security of the Protestant Succession is equally clear. Therefore it remains to be seen by what process we can best arrive at harmonising those two propositions. Surely the way in which that could be most effectually effected is by the constitution of a Committee of this House—a Committee not like the one which three years ago sat for a few minutes to consider a previously prepared document brought before it to be adopted almost without discussion, but a Committee upon which representatives of those who feel aggrieved by the expressions in the Declaration should be present — upon which Prelates of the Established Church, which is said to be threatened by any alteration of the Declaration, should also sit—a Committee composed of men from both sides of the House, impartial and experienced, who would give, not ten minutes or so, but a full and careful consideration to the question what words could be expunged without danger, and what words could be retained without offence.

Personally, I should be glad to see the Declaration altogether abolished, because I regard it as a mischievous anachronism—an anachronism, because the main object of its imposition upon the Crown was to prevent the exercise by a Roman Catholic of executive power then personally exercised by the King. But that executive power the King no longer exercises. It is now exercised by the Cabinet of the day, and if there is really an apprehension on the part of the British public against entrusting executive administration to Roman Catholic hands, that Declaration which the Sovereign makes should be required also from every member of the Cabinet on his becoming a confidential adviser of the Crown. But, as a matter of fact, that apprehension is no longer entertained. People are not now so sensitive as they used to be as to Roman Catholics occupying this or that office. There is hardly any of the highest offices of the State to which a Roman Catholic may not now aspire, and during the last twenty years no less than three different Secretaryships of State have been held by Roman Catholics. One of them held the Home Secretaryship, in which Department the executive power of the Crown in almost all that relates to executive administration in this country is vested. Those powers were admirably administered by a Roman Catholic, namely, by my noble friend Lord Llandaff. And what was the result of that appointment? Was there a panic created throughout England? Was there a general alarm at this executive power being placed in the hands of a Roman Catholic? Not at all. It was regarded with the utmost calmness. It caused no ruffle on the surface of society. Everybody knew that the interests of the Crown were as safe in those hands as in those of the sternest Prostestant.

But that is not the question before the House. I have stated my personal opinion that it is clear that the great majority of this House, and I believe the great majority of the country, desire that a Declaration of the King's Protestant belief should be retained. The only question then that remains is to render that Declaration as little offensive as may be to members of another faith. Now, if such a Committee as I have suggested be appointed, I think it would not only be not impossible, but really not very difficult, to arrive at a form of words which, on the one hand, would ensure the Protestantism of the King, and, on the other, would remove from the Declaration all that is offensive to Roman Catholics. I cannot understand, I confess, the position of the Government on this question. My noble friend the noble Marquess [Lord Ripon] and the most rev Primate, the Archbishop of Canterbury, say it is for the Government to initiate this matter. But the Government do not seem to accept that responsibility.

I hold that you will find in such a Committee as I have suggested the easiest, the best, and the safest way of arriving at an agreement or of discovering that an agreement is impossible. If the Committee do arrive at an agreement this question is then harmoniously settled, which your Lordships may be well assured the mere passing of the noble Earl's Resolution will certainly not effect. That Resolution will certainly not set the question at rest permanently. If, on the other hand, the Committee should really find out that the Protestant Succession to the Crown rests on so narrow a basis, on so insecure a foundation, that the omission of two or three words from the Declaration is likely to bring it to the ground with a crash, then at least those who object to any alteration will have a better ground for maintaining their argument than they have at present. I say, therefore, that in the interests of both parties the appointment of such a Committee is desirable. I would only add that it seems to me the conduct of His Majesty's Government with regard to this matter like that of a spoilt and pouting child. They have said, "We acknowledge that something should be done, we have proposed something to you to be done, but as you have rejected our prescription you shall not try any other." I say, now that the Government prescription has gone, let us try the prescription of referring the matter to a large Committee, well and carefully appointed, and let them thresh the matter out by seriously considering what words are justly objected to, and what words must necessarily be retained. I beg to move the Amendment standing in my name.

Amendment moved—

"To add the following words to the Resolution, 'and that a Select Committee be appointed to consider whether any unnecessarily offensive words may not be expunged from the King's Declaration without incurring such danger.'"—(*Lord Stanmore.*)

LORD TWEEDMOUTH: My Lords, I must confess that I regret the line which His Majesty's Government took with regard to the suggestion of my noble friend Lord Crewe, namely, to omit the last three lines of the noble Duke's Motion; and if the noble and learned Earl on the Woolsack will allow me to say so, I doubt the accuracy of his suggestion of order in that matter, because both in this House and in the other

House, I have known cases constantly happen in which, by leave of the House, movers of Resolutions have been allowed to slightly alter the terms of those Resolutions before they moved them.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: The noble Lord is mistaken. I never said it was out of order.

LORD TWEEDMOUTH: I beg the noble and learned Earl's pardon. I misunderstood him. I am sorry His Majesty's Government did not see their way to accept the amended Resolution in preference to the one moved by Lord Jersey; and for this reason, that the amended Resolution of the noble Duke would have given some definite conclusion for the House to arrive at. By passing that Resolution the House would have distinctly affirmed the desirablity of amending the Declaration as it now stands. The Resolution that we have now before us to amend, moved by Lord Jersey, suggests nothing at all. It leaves the whole question hung up without any suggestion being made. That, I think, is unfortunate, because from what I could gather, listening carefully to all the admirable speeches that have been made in the House to-day, there is practically unanimity that it is desirable, if possible, to amend this Declaration. I therefore say, my Lords, that it is almost the necessary consequence of our debate that further steps should be taken by way of appointing some sort of inquiry, whether it be by a Committee of this House or a Joint Committee of both Houses, or by a Royal Commission, to determine what further steps should be taken and whether some agreement could not be arrived at between the parties.

The noble Marquess said he thought that before the Government could consent to a Committee there should be some definite sign of a drawing together of the various parties to this discussion. I think my noble friend, Lord Herries, has to-night given a very considerable indication that there is such a drawing together. I think his speech distinctly showed that there was a desire on the part of the Catholic Peers, as voiced by my noble friend, to endeavour to come to terms with other parties in this House who desire to see the Declaration amended. I am not, of course, in a position to speak with authority in the matter, but I should hope very much that, supposing a Committee either of this House or of the two Houses was constituted, we should find Catholic Peers willing to take their seats on that Committee and to give to it the benefit of their advice and knowledge. On all grounds I would earnestly press on His Majesty's Government to complete the work of to-night by consenting to such a step being taken as will secure a further consideration of the matter from all its lights, and with the assistance of all parties.

THE DUKE OF NORTHUMBERLAND: My Lords, I agree with almost every word in the earlier part of the speech of the noble Lord who has just sat down. The noble Lord told us that we were in the awkward position of having come to a Resolution which had no definite conclusion, and then he went on to recommend that the Resolution should be the basis of the appointment of a Committee. I should have drawn just the opposite conclusion, and should have ventured to urge that if this House thinks it right to appoint a Committee to consider so grave and important a subject as this, it should give that Committee some much clearer mandate than it can find in the Resolution now before the House. Although the noble Lord who has just sat down does not attach any importance to the argument, I confess I am very much impressed by what has been said by the noble Marquess the Leader of this House as to the absolute necessity, before anything can be done in this matter, that some *rapprochement* between the various parties should be arrived at. I am not at this hour going to detain your Lordships with any further remarks, but I wish to take the opportunity of testing the feeling of the House upon this question, and therefore I venture to move "the previous Question." I trust we shall be willing to adopt that course as marking on the one hand our sense of the importance of the subject, and on the other our utter incapacity of dealing with it at the present moment.

Moved, The previous Question.—(*The Duke of Northumberland.*)

LORD TWEEDMOUTH: I submit that Lord Stanmore's Motion does give a distinct mandate. It says—

> "To consider whether any unnecessarily offensive words may not be expunged from the King's Declaration without incurring such danger."

THE LORD PRIVY SEAL (The Marquess of SALISBURY): My Lords, perhaps it is due to the House that I should explain the view His Majesty's Government take of the Motion which has been made by the noble Duke (the Duke of Northumberland). I do not agree with the criticisms which have been made by the noble Lord opposite (Lord Tweedmouth), nor do I agree with the criticisms of the noble mover of this particular Amendment. Lord Tweedmouth seemed to think that the Resolution to which the House has just come was an unsatisfactory Resolution. I cannot agree with him. It seems to me to be an expression of the opinion of the House in very felicitous language. In the first place, we express the opinion that we do not desire to see anything in the Declaration which is offensive to our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects, and, on the other hand, we assert our conviction that nothing must be done to injure the security of the Protestant Succession.

Neither can I agree that His Majesty's Government have failed to provide any prescription for the ill which the whole House admits. It is well known that on the last occasion—namely, last year—on which this subject was discussed in your Lordships' House, the then Leader of the House (the Duke of Devonshire) declared that the offer which the Government had previously made was still open, if that offer recommended itself to those who were interested in the subject. And, my Lords, that brings me to remind your Lordships that that offer was the outcome of the recommendation of a Committee. Well, the offer failed. That is to say, we have tried a Committee, and a Committee has not succeeded, and now we are asked to try another Committee. The Government naturally hesitate before assenting to the appointment of a Committee, which course has already been prescribed, and has failed to effect a cure. But we do not desire, of course, to take such an attitude as would absolutely close the door. My noble friend, the Leader of the House, has already explained to your Lordships that he is not without hope that an approximation of view between the two extreme sides of opinion on this question may be brought about, and I can assure your Lordships that if any such communications as the noble Marquess referred to reach His Majesty's Government, we shall receive them with the greatest respect, and with every hope that they may lead to a settlement. But it is clear we have not reached that point yet.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: Why not?

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The noble Lord opposite asks me why not. I have explained to him that there is no such approximation of view at present. If the noble Lord wishes me to go back into the arguments which have just been engaging your Lordships I will do so, but I think it is clearer from the speech of the noble Earl (Lord Crewe) than from that of anybody else, that there is a profound difference of opinion as to the way in which this subject ought to be approached. The noble Earl explained that what was essential in the Declaration as it stood was dissociation from the Roman Catholic position; that is to say, the mere assertion of adhesion to the Protestant faith was not, in his opinion, sufficient.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: What I said was that, like the most rev. Primate, I found it difficult to conceive the possibility of finding words which would express the Sovereign's adherence to the Protestant faith without such repudiation, but I said that I hoped such words could be found.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: At any rate, the noble Earl experienced great difficulty, and nothing that had been said in this debate had solved the difficulty, in his opinion. I think, therefore, that I am justified in saying that the difficulties have not been swept away, and that the time for appointing a Committee has not arrived. We shall cordially support the proposal of the noble Duke behind me, which will have the effect of not closing the door, and will at the same time prevent your Lordships from arriving at any decision.

*THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: My Lords, I should like to say a single word as to the ground on which alone I can support the noble Duke's Amendment. It is because the Government suggest that it is the best course for us to pursue, with a view to arriving at a solution of what is an admitted difficulty. If I understand rightly the speech of the noble Marquess who has just sat down, His Majesty's Government accepts the responsibility of ultimately having to deal with this matter, provided the preliminary steps can be taken which they have themselves suggested. That being so, I certainly think that we ought to adopt their advice as to the mode in which it is desirable to proceed. But if the previous Question means shelving this matter altogether, and saying that we are not to hear any more about it, and that those epithets which we all regard as so undesirable are to remain in the Declaration, then I could not vote for the noble Duke's proposition. It is on the other understanding that I shall be prepared to vote for it.

THE DUKE OF NORFOLK: My Lords, as I understand it, the House has now distinctly affirmed the principle that it is desirous that no expressions unnecessarily hurtful to Roman Catholics shall be contained in the Declaration. Having brought this matter forward, I feel bound to express my thanks to the House for having affirmed that, although it falls short of the decision I had hoped might have been come to. It seems to me that the obvious thing to do now is to appoint a Committee. That is the only logical position. If His Majesty's Government shrink from that, and if, as I understand, they pledge themselves——

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE dissented.

THE DUKE OF NORFOLK: I understood the noble Marquess, the Lord Privy Seal, to say that if a *rapprochement* could be brought about which would produce something like a settlement, His Majesty's Government would consider it, and do their best to secure its realisation.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: What was said as to the position of His Majesty's Government in regard to a *rapprochement* was that, if conclusive evidence of such a *rapprochement* were within our knowledge, we should then be prepared to consider the question of appointing a Committee, but that in the absence of such evidence we felt bound to oppose the Motion of the noble Lord.

VISCOUNT HALIFAX: My Lords, I should like to observe that the noble Marquess, the Lord Privy Seal, can hardly be aware of the terms of the amended Declaration as brought before the House by the Committee of 1901. If he will refresh his memory on that point, I think he will see that the amended Declaration was very nearly as objectionable as the original Declaration; and it was more objectionable in one respect. It is sometimes more possible to put up with something old which you have inherited, and for which you are not responsible, than to put up with something new for which you are responsible; and it certainly appeared to me that the result of the labours of the Committee, as shown in the Declaration which they brought forward, was at all events in that latter respect much more objectionable than the Declaration we have been considering to-day.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I did not say that the amended Declaration was perfect. My point was to call attention to the fact that the prescription of a Committee had been tried and had failed.

VISCOUNT HALIFAX: Yes, but I would point out to the noble Marquess that it does not follow that, because one Committee has failed, a wiser Committee would not succeed. I should like also to remind the noble Marquess that there is a most remarkable circumstance connected with this whole subject, and that is the difference between what people say in public and what they say in private. I have not met anyone in private who has not admitted that the Declaration is offensive and superfluous, but when they come to talk about the matter in public, they appear to be so dreadfully intimidated by the fear of Orange opposition that they lose all their common sense. It has been mentioned already this afternoon, but I think it might be mentioned again, that at this particular moment there is nothing whatever to prevent every single Member of the House of Commons and of this House being a Roman Catholic.

There is another fact to which I should like to draw attention, which throws a good deal of light upon the sincerity of the arguments which have been adduced, and upon the real weight that lies behind them. I believe that most of the Noncomformist bodies, to whom much of the opposition to this proposal is due, and certainly the great mass of the Liberal Party have all committed themselves to the position that to impose a test upon any teacher in any school supported by public funds is a thing not to be tolerated. Look at the consequence of that in regard to a teacher who is to teach religion. That teacher may be a Roman Catholic, and yet no danger arises to the child ; but in the case of the King, who teaches nobody, and whose religious opinions will not affect, probably, a single one of his subjects, we are at once told that the whole situation is in danger if the King is to be—what ?—to be relieved of his Coronation Oath ? — No—to be relieved of the provisions of the Act of Settlement ?—No, but merely to be relieved of a test which is admitted to be offensive, which is not necessary, and which puts the King in a most disagreeable position, compelling him to do that which is most disagreeable and offensive, not only to his Roman Catholic subjects, but, despite the presence of the right rev. Prelate who spoke a short time ago—the Lord Bishop of Bristol—to all well-instructed Christians, who are not the victims of ignorance and prejudice.

Last year we heard with very great pleasure a statement from the most rev. Primate the Archbishop of Canterbury that he did not think it impossible to devise a form of words which should not condemn or repudiate specific doctrines, and we hoped, after that statement, that the most rev. Primate, in conjunction with the noble Duke who brought this subject before your Lordships to-day, might have been able to arrive at such a modified Declaration as might be passed by the agreement of the whole House. I ask, if such a course is a desirable one, and one which we all wished to see carried out, how can we arrive at it except by the appointment of a Committee ? I earnestly hope your Lordships will see your way to pass the addition moved by the noble Lord on the Cross Benches, for it is not to the credit of this House that an important question of this kind should be pushed on one side for fear of opposition which has only to be looked in the face for it to be seen how little importance there is in it.

On Question, their Lordships divided :—Contents, 36 ; Not-contents, 103.

CONTENTS.

Norfolk, D. (*E. Marshall*)
Fife, D.
Grafton, D.

Ripon, M.

Abingdon, E.
Camperdown, E.
Carlisle, E.
Crewe, E.
Feversham, E.
Gainsborough, E.
Kimberley, E.
Westmeath, E.

Halifax, V.
Llandaff, V.

Arundell of Wardour, L.
Brampton, L.
Braye, L.
Burghclere, L.
Clifford of Chudleigh, L.
Dormer, L.
Dunning, L. (*L. Rollo*)
Emly, L.
Gage, L. (*V. Gage*)
Granard, L. (*E. Granard*)
Grey de Ruthyn, L.
Heneage, L.
Herries, L. [*Teller*]
Killanin, L.
Leigh, L.
Monteagle of Brandon, L.
Newton, L.
North, L.
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Stanmore, L. [*Teller*]
Sudley, L. (*E. Arran*)
Tweedmouth, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Canterbury, L. Abp.
Halsbury, E. (*L. Chancellor*)
Vane, E. (*M. Londonderry*) (*L. President*)
Salisbury, M. (*L. Privy Seal*)

Marlborough, D.
Northumberland, D.
Wellington, D.

Abercorn, M. (*D. Abercorn*)
Ailesbury, M.
Bath, M.
Bristol, M.
Lansdowne, M.
Winchester, M.
Zetland, M.

Pembroke and Montgomery, E. (*L. Steward*)

Viscount Halifax.

Clarendon, E. (*L. Chamberlain*)
Albemarle, E.
Amherst, E.
Carnwath, E.
Cawdor, E.
Chichester, E.
Coventry, E.
Dartmouth, E.
Dartrey, E.
Hardwicke, E.
Harewood, E.
Harrowby, E.
Jersey, E.
Lindsey, E.
Mansfield, E.
Morton, E.
Mount Edgcumbe, E.
Northesk, E.
Onslow, E.
Portsmouth, E.
Roberts, E.
Romney, E.
Rosse, E.
Saint Germans, E.
Selborne, E.
Stradbroke, E.
Waldegrave, E. [*Teller*]

Churchill, V. [*Teller*]
Cross, V.
Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore*)
Portman, V.

Bristol, L. Bp.
London, L. Bp.
Ripon, L. Bp.
Addington, L.
Allerton, L.
Alverstone, L.
Amherst of Hackney, L.
Ashcombe, L.
Bateman, L.
Belper, L.
Blythswood, L.
Calthorpe, L.
Carysfort, L. (*E. Carysfort*)
Chelmsford, L.
Cheylesmore, L.
Clanwilliam L. (*E. Clanwilliam*)
Colchester, L.
Congleton, L.
Cottesloe, L.
De L'Isle and Dudley, L.
Douglas, L. (*E. Home*)
Dunboyne, L.
Ellenborough, L.
Forester, L.
Glanusk, L.
Greville, L.
Harris, L.
Hatherton, L.
Hawkesbury, L.
Hothfield, L.
Kenyon, L.
Kilmarnock, L. (*E. Erroll*)
Kinnaird, L.
Kintore, L. (*E. Kintore*)
Lawrence, L.
Lindley, L.
Macnaghten, L.
Middleton, L.
Monck, L. (*V. Monck*)
Monckton, L. (*V. Galway*)
Mostyn, L.
Napier, L.
Newlands, L.
Ormathwaite, L.
Raglan, L.
Ravensworth, L.
Robertson, L.
Saltoun, L.
Scarsdale, L.
Tenterden, L.
Tredegar, L.
Wenlock, L.
Willoughby de Broke, L.
Wimborne, L.
Windsor, L.
Wolverton, L.
Zouche of Haryngworth, L.

CHANTREY TRUST.

The following Lords were named of the Select Committee—

E. Carlisle. L. Ribblesdale.
E. Lytton. L. Newton.
E. Crewe. L. llanin.
L. Windsor.

The Committee to meet on Tuesday next, at three o'clock, and to appoint their own Chairman.

OPEN SPACES BILL [H.L.].

Read 3^{a} (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

RESERVE FORCES BILL [H.L.].

Read 3^{a} (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes past Seven o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 1*st July*, 1904.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—Barry Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill [Lords]; Oakengates and Dawley Joint Water Board Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS [LORDS] (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz.:—Canal Rates and Charges (Regent's Canal) Order Confirmation Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time upon Monday next.

COUNTY OF SUFFOLK BILL (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO NOT COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred pursuant to the Order of the House of the 27th day of June, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have not been complied with, viz.:—County of Suffolk Bill.

Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders.

London and North Western Railway Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Ticehurst and District Water and Gas Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Clyde Valley Electrical Power Bill [Lords]. As amended, to be considered upon Monday next.

Minehead Urban District Council Water Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

London County Council (General Powers) Bill. Ordered, That Standing Order 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Melrose District Water Order Confirmation Bill. Considered; to be read the third time upon Monday next.

Tynemouth Corporation Bill [Lords]; Harrogate Waterworks Tramroad Bill [Lords]; Ebbw Vale Urban District Water Bill [Lords]; Derwent Valley Water Board Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Richard Jaeger's Patent Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table.

St. Mary Woolnoth Bill [Lords]. Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time.

Education Board Provisional Order (Birmingham) Bill [Lords]. Reported, without Amendments [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time upon Monday next.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [Lords]. Reported, without Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time upon Monday next.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Motherwell, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; from Aberfeldy; Accrington; Ardsley; Ashton under Lyne; Badbury; Barry; Barry Dock; Bodmin; Bradford; Brailes; Broad Town; Bronynant; Cawthorne; Cheadle; Chesham (eight); Colwyn Bay; Cottingham; Crowton; Dalton; Dunmore; East Glamorgan; Edinburgh; Edlesborough; Enderby; Falkirk; Falmouth; Glaisdale; Hackney; Hampton Court; Harthill; Higher Walton; Histon; Hodson; Houlsyke; Hoylake; Hurnworth on Tees; Ketley Bank; Kidderminster; Lanark; Lancaster; Langthorpe; Littleworth; Llanivet; London; Loxley; Mapperley; Market Rasen; Marton le Moor; Melbourne (two); Melmerby; Methwold; Middle Rasen; Morecambe (two); Motherwell (two); Mountsorrel (two); Nanstallon; Newcastle-on-Tyne (two); Norton le Clay; Nottingham; Penmaenrhos; Polbrock; Pontlottyn; Rainton; St. Helen's; Scarborough; Selkirk; Snow Hill; Stockport; Stratford; Swindon; Swinton; Tamworth; Terrington St. Clement; Thorpe; Tottenham (two); Turnchapel; Upper Stratton; Walthamstow; Wanborough; Warborough; Westerdale; West Kirby; Whitwinch; Wigan; and Wroughton; to lie upon the Table.

LANDS VALUATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Motherwell, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LAND VALUES TAXATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Motherwelll in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Leek; and Nottingham; to lie upon the Table.

RAILWAYS (PRIVATE SIDINGS) BILL.

Petition from Motherwell, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SMALL HOLDERS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Motherwell, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

TUBERCULOSIS (ANIMALS) COMPENSATION BILL.

Petition from Motherwell, against; to lie upon the Table.

VALUATION BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Crediton; and Hayfield; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

WHALING AND WHALE-CURING (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of Report of a Departmental Committee appointed by the Secretary for Scotland to inquire into the new Whaling and Whale-curing Industry on the Coast of Scotland and the adjacent waters. Vol. I., Report [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Draft Scheme of Charity Commissioners for Whitstable Charities.

MR. SLACK (Hertfordshire, St. Albans): To ask the hon. Member for Tonbridge, as Parliamentary Charity Commissioner, whether his attention has been called to the local opposition to the draft scheme of the Charity Commissioners for the Whitstable Charities, in the county of Kent, in which the income originally provided for the payment of teachers' salaries is to be applied to the maintenance of the buildings of the Whitstable and Seasalter national school; and whether the Commissioners will abstain from sanctioning and sealing the scheme until they have heard the views of the Whitstable Urban District Council and of the local education authority.

(*Answered by Mr. Griffith Boscawen.*) The Commissioners are making a scheme for the purpose of determination under The Board of Education Act, 1899. At the request of the trustees, and of the Board of Education, made by letter of 12th March, 1903, they consented to embody in the scheme arrangements for raising money to effect a necessary enlargement of the school. These arrangements, and the plans for the new buildings, were submitted by the Commissioners' desire to the Kent Local Education Authority. The Commissioners were, on 23rd February, 1904, informed of the formal approval of the plans by the local education authority and the Board of Education. The scheme was duly published, and a copy sent to the Whitstable Urban District Council on 29th April last. No objection was received by the Commissioners, and the expenditure has accordingly proceeded, with their sanction, and it does not appear possible to raise now any question as to these arrangements, but, subject thereto, no diversion of the money applicable for teachers' salaries is effected by the scheme.

Transfer of Powers of Irish Harbour Commissioners to the County Councils.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he would have any objection to introduce a short Bill this session, giving the Irish Local Government Board power, by Provisional Order, to transfer to a county council any of the powers, duties, and liabilities of any harbour commissioners or trustees (except the commissioners of Royal harbours) in cases where such a transfer is agreed to both by the county council and by the trustees or commissioners.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) I beg to refer the hon. Baronet to Section 20 of The Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1898, and to the powers of the Board of Trade under the general Piers and Harbours Acts. No further legislation in reference to the matter appears to be necessary.

Delay in the Publication of Consular Reports.

MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he will explain why delay in publication till 27th June took place in connection with a Consular Report from Malaga received at the Foreign Office on 19th May, with a Consular Report from Persia received on 16th May, and with a Consular Report from Ningpo received on 27th May; and whether he will endeavour to expeite the publication of such Reports.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) The date of publication was Saturday the 25th of June. The delay was with the printer, whose attention will be called to the matter, but it is no doubt due to the fact that the chief pressure of the year occurs at this time.

Scales for Weighing Letters in Sub-Post Offices.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): To ask the Postmaster-General whether, in view of the fact that in small districts where sub-postmasters earn on an average about £7 a year they are compelled to provide at their own expense scales and weights for use in weighing letters, while spring balances are supplied by the Post Office for weighing parcels, he will order that weights and scales shall also be provided in such sub-post offices free by the Department.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) It was formerly the rule to require sub-postmasters at offices of the class mentioned to provide weights and scales for weighing letters; but for many years it has been the practice for the Department to supply these articles when the circumstances appeared to justify such a course.

Remuneration of Irish Sub-Postmasters.

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): To ask the Postmaster-General if he will state the amount of remuneration annually paid to sub-postmasters in Ireland, with and without money order and telegraph offices attached.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) I am obtaining this information, and will communicate it to the hon. Member.

Customs—Promotion of Junior Assistant Clerks for Special Checking Work.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that in the Statistical Department of the Customs several junior assistant clerks have been awarded a special checking allowance of £30 per annum; that these clerks have less than seven years service, and that they have been selected for this promotion, passing over many senior assistant clerks of approved character and ability, with three times their length of service; and, if so, whether he can give any special reason in explanation.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) I am informed that there have been three such selections, and that the junior assistants clerk were so selected because they were more capable than any on the list of senior assistant clerks.

LICENSING BILL (PROCEDURE).

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.), on rising to move the Resolution of which he had given notice for the expedition of the Licensing Bill, was received with loud cheers and counter-cheers and cries of "Gag."

*MR. SPEAKER: I hope that throughout this debate, which obviously causes considerable excitement, hon. Members will refrain from using other than purely Parliamentary expressions.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think, at all events, I can promise that nothing I shall say this morning will add to the excitement the effects of which you, Mr. Speaker, deprecate. Before I enter on the arguments which I hope will convince the House that the Motion I am making is a reasonable and necessary one, may I say, by way of preface, that in the manner in which it has been placed on the Paper—that is, as to the amount of notice given—the Government has not been open to the criticisms which have been freely made against it? We have been accused of violating all the precedents in respect of the shortness of the notice given to the House and the consequent inconvenience imposed on hon. Members who may have desired to give notice of opposition or to consider the course they should take when the Motion is introduced. I was very much startled by a statement of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Aberdeen, and I have since looked up the precedents. It will not take a moment, if the House will allow me, to run through them. I find that in the case of the Crimes Act of 1887 notice was given at the commencement of the sitting of 9th June and the Motion was moved on 10th June.]

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): But there is a good deal of difference between giving notice in the afternoon and after midnight.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: In the case of the Parnell Commission Act of 1888 notice was given on 1st August and the Motion was taken on 2nd August. In the case of the Home Rule Bill of 1893 notice was given (the terms not being settled till the afternoon) on the 28th day of the month and the Motion was made on the 29th. In the case of the Evicted Tenants Bill of 1894 notice was given in the afternoon of 30th July and the Motion was moved on 31st July. It will be seen, therefore, that we have far exceeded the notice given in the case of all these precedents; and, although I do not wish to base myself on precedents, I should be sorry if the House remained under the impression that any unusual course has been taken now against their interest. If there has been a departure from precedent, it has been in the direction of extending and not restricting the amount of notice given.

In moving this Resolution I do not propose for one instant to discuss the merits of the Bill which we have had under consideration. It would be out of order. It would not only be out of order, it would be wholly irrelevant to the argument which I propose to address to the House; for I do not think any hon. Gentleman is competent, if I may respectfully say so, to give a judgment on the Motion I am now proposing, unless he considers that Motion in relation to the whole course not merely of Parliamentary business in this session, but in any session. And it is because on the broadest principles I believe there is no course open to us but that which I have adopted that I am now asking the House to adopt it. It is no new opinion of mine—it has been an opinion often expressed in this House, and it has been an opinion of predecessors of mine of greater authority — that the Parliamentary machine cannot be expected to work smoothly, efficiently, or reasonably if too great a tax is put upon it as regards the time to which its sessions extend or the labours with which those sessions are occupied. In my judgment, and speaking broadly, I think six months and a half is quite as much time as it is wise to ask the House of Commons to give to its work. I think it would be most foolish to lay down a fixed day, as is the rule in some foreign countries, when our labours should come to an end. I quite agree that exceptional circumstances may arise when we may profitably but unfortunately drag on our deliberations to much beyond the period I have suggested; but that period, with the exception of the Education Bill year, has been the normal period, or about the normal period, since 1896. It is far in excess of the labour imposed in France, in Germany, and in Italy on the Parliaments of those respective countries; and I am convinced that no worse service could be done to the House of Commons than to ask it to undertake an average of business that would extend, roughly speaking, not only beyond the six months and a half I have spoken of, but to some indefinite period that might extend—as, indeed, on one occasion it did extend—not only over the remaining months of the year in which the session started, but far into the year succeeding.

If that general proposition be accepted, and I do not think it will be denied, surely this second proposition will be accepted by any man who considers in a calm and reasonable spirit the conditions under which we carry on Parliamentary legislation. These six months and a half must be devoted, of course, to more than one subject—I will classify the subjects in a moment—but everybody must admit surely that a reasonable portion of the time must be granted to the Government of the day for carrying through its legislation. Of course, if the Government of the day brings forward some enormous and impossible programme—I do not mean in the sense of unreasonable, but impossible in point of size—and endeavours to thrust this down the throats of the House of Commons—if we are guilty of the charge of having brought forward, or of being desirous of thrusting down the throats of the House of Commons, a programme of unreasonable size, then I think there would be a valid reason against the Motion I am now proposing. Now, how are you going to allocate the various kinds of business the House has to deal with in the course of an average session of six and a half months? I will venture to say that perhaps the first and most important business is the function of criticising the administrative action of the Government that happens to be in office; and I think that any attempt to unduly shorten the time for this function for the purpose of passing great legislative measures, be they good or bad, is to be deprecated. But while giving full play to the duty of criticism, there must be a limit to the function of criticism if you are going to sit only six months and a half and are going to legislate and are manifestly going to be occupied in something besides comments, reasonable and fair though they be, on the administration of the affairs of the country. Consider what time we spend upon this during the session. I will classify the occasions. There is, first, the debate on the King's Speech, there are the debates in Supply, on adjournments of the House moved at Question time, discussion upon Motions of adjournment for the holidays, and debates on votes of censure. These are the occasions when criticism takes place. The next call upon the time of the House is that made in the interests of private Members—I do not mean in reference to private Bill legislation, but public business proposed by private Members; and I think the House will admit that, having done our best to put the rights of private Members on a fair and solid basis, having regard to the time at our disposal, we have faithfully adhered to the compact—I will not say compact—the arrangement arrived at when the Rules were revised. In no single case has the Government this session trespassed on a Tuesday, Wednesday, or Friday upon which a private Member by the Standing Orders has had a prior claim. That is the second great block of work that has to be done. The third is the Budget; and the fourth is ordinary legislation. In regard to the Budget I will say a word in a moment, I mean in relation to my argument. Well, I will say it now, that the House may see the line of argument I am trying to develop. There are times when it would be absurd not to distinguish the Budget from ordinary legislation. The great death duties Budget of the right hon. Gentleman opposite was a case in point; it was legislation of the most novel and most controversial kind, which it might be quite right to pass, but which for business considerations must be regarded as part of the controversial work of the year; but, without going into its merits or demerits, that surely cannot be urged against the Budget this year. There must be a Budget to deal with the year's finance if the money obligations of the Government are to be fulfilled; and I do not think that financial business could be carried on or obligations fulfilled by a less controversial method than that adopted by my right hon. friend. I do not do more than touch upon this, but I think every fair-minded man will recognise that I am not wrong. Having thus classified the business of the session, it is manifest that the time you give to one department of our activity must in proportion be taken from another. If the House insists on spending night after night on criticism, the time to be given to the consideration of legislation must thereby be curtailed. It is not a matter for argument, it is a simple question of addition and subtraction.

In the light of these general propositions, let the House consider the course of business this session. Before Easter we had one afternoon sitting, and one afternoon sitting alone, which we were able to devote to legislation, all the rest of the time was entirely taken up by what I have described as criticism. Between Easter and Whitsuntide we had seven afternoon sittings for legislation, and since Whitsuntide we have had twelve afternoons for legislation. In my opinion that is too little. I know that an hon. Gentleman who interrupted me earlier thinks the House has not had enough time for criticism and that everything that for the moment stemmed and diverted the flood of criticism, anything that saved here and there an afternoon for legislation and has prevented it being used for purposes of criticism has been an afternoon wasted. I do not deny that criticism of a Government may be reasonable and useful; all I say is, if you consider the burden upon Parliament, the time has been in excess of that which should be given to it. I will not say it has been couched in improper language, or that it has been on improper subjects, or that it has been of a kind that an Opposition in the carrying out of its constitutional functions should not make on the Government in power; but I do say, and say emphatically, if you are only going to allow the Government to have one afternoon before Easter for legislation and if between Easter and Whitsuntide you allow only seven, and when the course of business subsequent to that has been of the character which is fresh in every hon. Member's recollection, then I say you are making an apportionment of the time given to us for our work on wrong principles, which does not allow enough for legislation and gives too much for the element of criticism. Of course, as I have said, there is one qualification of the general principle I have laid down which must never be absent from the minds of hon. Members on either side. Repeating what I said earlier, while you must give reasonable time for legislation, it is on the other hand the duty of the Government not to ask the House to attempt a too great legislative task in the time available. If this Motion were brought forward to enable us to pass one Party measure after another, a series of Government Bills to which the Opposition strongly objected, if we attempted to force such Bills through the House of Commons by the method to which I have now unhappily to ask the House to assent, that would be an unreasonable and tyrannical use of the power of a majority. Can any reasonable man who looks at our programme of legislation think that so far as controversial Bills are concerned we are throwing an undue burden on the House, or that the Resolution I am asking the House to pass to-day is an undue attempt to make light of the task of Parliament, or that I ignore the desire for fresh air and exercise we hope to realise somewhere about the middle of August?

Now let me pass on to consider the work before us and our means of accomplishing it if this Resolution is carried. Let us suppose—it is not, I know the time for a statement on the Government programme—let us suppose, for the sake of argument, that there are only two Bills which can be certainly said to divide the House on strictly Party lines, the Licensing Bill and the Defaulting Authorities Bill. Let us suppose these are the two Bills. I have not made any statement about business, I am laying before the House a hypothesis which I think will enable them exactly to understand the position in which we stand with regard to business, and it is on that position, and that position alone, that I rest this morning my argument for the Resolution before us. On the hypothesis that the only controversial Bills are the Licensing Bill and the Defaulting Authorities Bill, I do not myself think it is possible that the House should rise before its ordinary time—12th August. On that hypothesis, will anybody say that is an unreasonable amount of legislation? I have never known hon. or right hon. Gentlemen opposite, when they were in the place which we now occupy, content themselves with so modest a programme. Hon. Gentlemen seem to think it is relevant to this argument that they happen to dislike both these Bills, if they do, as I think they do. But we have usually disliked the Bills that hon. Gentlemen have brought in; and I see no prospect of that happy day of harmony coming when the Opposition, from whichever side of the House they may be drawn, will rush into the lobby in support of controversial measures brought forward by their opponents. The argument is altogether outside the merits or demerits of a Bill, or whether a Bill is liked or not. Nobody can deny, even if we restrict our controversial proposals to these two Bills, that the session will be at least equal to a session of ordinary length. I claim that the House has a right to deal, favourably or unfavourably as it chooses, with these Bills; and I claim further that the Government which allows itself to be defeated by time on measures of that character and in the circumstances on which I have endeavoured to rest my appeal to the House—I think that the Government which allows itself to be beaten by time, would really be unworthy of the responsibility which rests upon it.

I have little more to say except to point out to the House, with regard to the particular Bill to which this Resolution refers, that it is, if I may venture to say so, wholly absurd to say that it will be otherwise than adequately and fully discussed by this House under the Resolution. I am not going to minimise the importance of the Bill, because I think its importance is very great; but it does not embody many novel principles. It embodies the principle that existing licences, whether they be ordinary licences or whether they be ante-1869 beer licences, should not be taken away without compensation. Nobody can say that that principle has not been adequately discussed. It embodies the principle that new licences should only be granted under conditions which would prevent a monopoly growing up—a most important principle, but one on which there is no division of opinion between the two sides of the House. We have already settled in debate the modification of magisterial jurisdiction; we have already discussed in Committee the time limit; we have already discussed in Committee the important, but what I will venture to call the subsidiary, point of tied houses, and the basis of compensation; and the general policy of the Government as to new licences has, of course, been before the House more than once. I therefore entirely deny that the fundamental principles of this Bill, the principles which make it approved of on this side of the House or disapproved of on the other side of the House, have not been thoroughly thrashed out and that in the time still left in the compartment provided by this Resolution there will not be ample and adequate time for dealing with the strictly subsidiary points which may still remain to be discussed. But let the House remember this. The question before us is not whether particular speeches have been too long or too short, or whether particular Amendments were reasonable or unreasonable. The question is not whether the House could not go on discussing this Bill for weeks or months without irrelevancy, without anything which in the narrower use of that word might properly be described as obstruction. An ingenious friend of mine has made a calculation which seems to show that, if the progress of the Bill in the future is to be precisely upon all fours with its progress in the past, it will take exactly a year and a quarter to pass it. I do not know whether that calculation, were we to allow a year and a quarter, would prove to be below or above the mark, but I earnestly deprecate allowing a year and a quarter, or anything like it, because I think it would mean absolute ruin to debates in this House. When the right hon. Gentleman who moved the closure by compartments on the Evicted Tenants Bill came down and, in a ten minutes speech, recommended that proposal to the House, I remember that in his peroration he insisted upon taking up the Paper of Amendments and saying:—"If you want justification for this Motion—*circumspice.*" The Amendments which so frightened the right hon. Gentleman with regard to the Evicted Tenants Bill consisted only of 22 pages. There are now 65 pages of Amendments on the Paper with reference to the Bill which we are now discussing. I do not doubt that these 65 pages will prove highly prolific and will have a progeny not less numerous than themselves.

The House will see now the grounds—not irrational grounds, I think—on which I venture to ask them to pass this Resolution. It is described, and from one point of view accurately described, as a curtailment of the liberties of this House. But unless the House will consent voluntarily to certail its opportunities of discussion, I venture to say it is perfectly impossible from time to time to avoid passing a Resolution of this kind. There is one thing worse than this species of curtailment of the liberties of the House, and that is that we should become a wholly impotent Assembly, carrying on endless debates month after month, wearisome to ourselves, nauseous to the country, and destructive to the dignity and efficiency of this Assembly. I do not deny that such powers as I am now asking for may be abused. I do not deny that Governments to come, as Governments in the past, may come down to the House and ask for powers of this character which would indeed be a dangerous attack upon the liberties of the House. Each case must be judged by the House on its merits; and if the time should come, as perhaps it may, when other Ministries are in power, if they find themselves within six weeks of the normal termination of the session, having had but a relatively insignificant amount of time allowed them for their legislation, and if the programme that they put forward is as modest in point of bulk as that which we have pressed upon the House, I do not see myself how it would be possible for the House not to feel, as I feel now, that it is in the interests of this Assembly that some such step as this should be taken to prevent the evils which otherwise would ensue.

Sir, I do not propose to claim for this Party the possession of greater virtues than those I see so amply exhibited upon the Benches opposite. It may be that we shall also ask for night after night on the King's Speech, for one evening after another spent in discussions on the Adjournment of the House, and for all the opportunities of criticism which have occupied us since 2nd February, when we met. But if that occasion should occur, then, but then only, would they come down to the House with the kind of justification which I claim for the Resolution which I ask the House to accept. I am perfectly certain that if we desire to retain the place that we have hitherto held in public estimation one of two things must be done. Some Leader of the House must come down with a general scheme of distribution of the business which shall avoid the evils I have endeavoured to detail to the House or else from time to time, very rarely I hope, but inevitably now and then, those responsible for the conduct of business, from whatever side they are chosen, will feel, however unpleasant the necessity may be—and it can be pleasant to no man—that they will be compelled to come down and ask the future House of Commons for the same powers which I now with some confidence ask this House to give us.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the proceedings in Committee and on Report of the Licensing Bill shall be brought to a conclusion in the manner hereinafter mentioned on six allotted days—

"(*a*) The proceedings in Committee on Clause 1 on the first allotted day.

"(*b*) The proceedings in Committee on Clauses 2 and 3 on the second allotted day.

"(*c*) The proceedings in Committee on Clause 4 on the third allotted day.

"(*d*) The proceedings in Committee on the remaining clauses of the Bill, and on any new Government clauses, and on schedules and any new Government schedules, and any other proceedings necessary to bring the Committee stage to a conclusion on the fourth allotted day.

"(*e*) The proceedings on Report on any new clauses and on Amendments to Clauses 1, 2, and 3 of that Bill, be brought to a conclusion on the fifth allotted day; and

(*f*) The proceedings on Report be concluded on the sixth allotted day.

After this Order comes into operation, any day shall be considered an allotted day for the purposes of this Order on which the Licensing Bill is put down as the first Order of the Day:

At 11 p.m. on the said allotted days, or if the day is a Friday at 4.30 p.m., the Chairman or Speaker shall put forthwith the Question or Questions on any Amendment or Motion already proposed from the Chair, and shall next proceed successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments moved by the Government of which notice has been given (but no other Amendments) and on every Question necessary to dispose of the allotted business to be concluded on the allotted day.

In the case of Government Amendments, or of Government new clauses or schedules, he shall put only the Question that the Amendment be made, or that the clause or schedule be added to the Bill, as the case may be.

"At 12 midnight on the day on which the Third Reading of the Bill is put down as first Order, or, if that day is a Friday, at 5.30 p.m., the Speaker shall put forthwith any Question necessary to conclude the proceedings on that stage of the Bill.

"Proceedings to which this Order relates shall not be interrupted (except at an Afternoon Sitting at 7.30 p.m.), under the provisions of any Standing Order relating to Sittings of the House:

"After the passing of this Order, on any day on which any proceedings on the Licensing Bill stand as the first Order of the Day, no dilatory Motion on the Bill, nor under Standing Order No. 10, nor Motion to postpone a clause, shall be received unless moved by the Minister in charge of the Bill, and the Question on any such Motion shall be put forthwith. Nor shall any opposed Private Business be set down at the Evening Sitting for consideration on any of the allotted days or on the day on which the Third Reading of the Bill is put down as first Order.

"If Progress be reported, the Chairman shall put this Order in force in any subsequent sitting of the Committee."—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): In rising to move the Amendment which stands in my name, I am not going to criticise in detail but I shall traverse from top to bottom, from beginning to end, the proposition of the right hon. Gentleman—a proposition which I tell him frankly at the outset is, in our judgment, an outrage upon the dignity and liberties of the House of Commons. Sir, the right hon. Gentleman occupied much the larger part of his speech with a disquisition which seemed to me to have very little relevancy indeed to the question, upon the possibility of a more philosophic, a more artistic, distribution of Parliamentary time. But there was one serious fallacy, unperceived apparently by the right hon. Gentleman, latent in the whole of his argument, viz., that the persons who are responsible for the distribution of Parliamentary time are not the persons who sit on the Bench opposite. Why, the right hon. Gentleman tells us that we have spent a great deal of time in criticising the administrative action of the Government. So we have. But criticism must bear some proportion to the area of criticisable matter, and if a Government provides such an unexampled provision, as His Majesty's present advisers have done, of material for criticism in every quarter of the globe, and in every branch of administration, this House would surely be failing in its duty if it did not attempt and agree, with no slow and laggard steps, to keep pace with the abnormal activities of those who are responsible for the government of the country. But what opportunities have the Government given us for discussing their legislation? Take this very Bill—the Licensing Bill, the capital measure of the session, as the right hon. Gentleman himself admits. It was not introduced until the 20th of April. The Motion for the Second Reading was not made until the 9th of May, and here we are on the 1st of July—having spent nominally six, but in reality something like three Parliamentary days on it in Committee. It is that mismanagement of the Parliamentary business, of the Parliamentary time—it is that tardy and delaying treatment of subjects which the Government asked the House to believe to be of capital and national importance, it is that, far more than prolixity or exuberance of speech on one side of the House or the other, which has brought Parliamentary business into the intolerable muddle which the right hon. Gentleman comes here to-day to confess and for which he asks the House to provide him with arbitrary means of escape.

I must say one more word about this matter of time. On how many evenings were the first hour or two at any rate, deliberately frittered away by Gentlemen opposite, docile and most convenient followers of the Government, in order that time might be given to others to transact their other avocations before coming here to perform their Parliamentary duties? We have read in the ordinary means of communication, of the almost despairing appeals which have been made by the Government Whips to get their men to come to do their duty, and the not obscure menace of the Prime Minister, that if they did not do so they would be sent to the country to answer to their constituents. I am not sure whether these Whips have been very effective so far. I cannot help contrasting the full and animated appearance of the Benches opposite to-day, when it is not a question of getting on with the business of the country, but of curtailing the facilities for discussion in this House and of accelerating the advent of the holidays, I cannot help contrasting the appearance of those Benches now with that which they presented on many an evening during the discussions on the Finance Bill and on the Licensing Bill itself.

I want to avoid following the example which the right hon. Gentleman has set, and to come to close quarters with the actual proposal he has made. The right hon. Gentleman has dealt in a very light and offhand fashion with the question of precedents, and I venture to say that there is not a single one of the not very numerous cases in which this sort of procedure has been resorted to, by one Government or another, which affords any colour or pretext for the proposition of the right hon. Gentleman. In every case but that of the Evicted Tenants Bill the Bill under discussion had been in Committee for twenty or thirty days, and I think, in one instance, for more than thirty days. That was not so in the case of the Evicted Tenants Bill, I agree. But what was the reason? The reason given by my right hon. friend, who then led the House, for the drastic proposal he made, was that it was in the interests of social order. It was because it was believed by the Government, and by the majority of this House at that day, that, unless that Bill was promptly and expeditiously passed, the cause of social order in Ireland would be in serious danger. That single exception stood on its own legitimate footing. But there is not a single case in which a Minister has come to this House to ask for such powers, without any attempt to prove that there has been something in the shape of organised obstruction. Our discussions in Committee on this Bill — I want the House to realise the facts of the case — we have occupied nominally six days, but in reality the exact time is thirty-four hours. How has that time been occupied? I will give the House some figures which I think will prove instructive. I have them for each of the sittings. At the first sitting there were twenty-five speeches made from the Government Benches, and twenty-three from the Opposition Benches. At the second sitting twelve speeches were delivered from the Government Benches, and eleven from the Opposition Benches. The third sitting hardly counts, for it only lasted half an hour; but at the fourth sitting there were twenty Government speeches and thirty-two Opposition speeches. At the next sitting there were nineteen Government speeches and twenty-six Opposition speeches; and on the last occasion there were thirty-four Government speeches and forty-one Opposition speeches. In other words, during the thirty-four odd hours there were delivered from the Government Benches 115 speeches, and from the Opposition side 135; but a very large proportion — I believe thirty — of the speeches on the Government side of the House were made either suggesting or actually supporting Amendments. It is impossible, in the face of facts like these, to say that any case has been made out for anything in the nature of obstruction. I may say, having sat through the Committee stage of this Bill, and having in that respect the advantage of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House, that during the whole of my experience in this House, which is that of a great number of years, I never heard more business-like discussions—discussions in which the speeches were terser, more argumentative, and more obviously animated by a desire to grapple with the real difficulties of the case. If that had not been so, we surely would have had a more repeated application of the closure. I do not think, though I know that it has been refused once, that the closure has been granted more than twice; and I am quite certain that any one who has actually observed the proceedings of the Committee will agree that no case whatever has been made out that any point has been more than adequately discussed.

The right hon. Gentleman has given us an imaginary sketch of the points which have been considered in Committee. It must have been supplied to him by somebody else, because he was not here. This is not the occasion to discuss the merits of the Bill; but to show how imaginary that sketch is, let me just call attention to this one fact, that we are at this moment in the midst and by no means near the end of the discussion, of what, I agree, is not the most important but a very important principle, viz., the demarcation of the jurisdiction between the licensing justices on the one side and the quarter sessions on the other. Assuming that the proposed change is made, any man who has followed these debates will agree that it is difficult to say where the one begins and the other ends. The same may be said to be true of a vast number of the provisions that have been discussed. I say, then, in the language of the Amendment I have put on the Paper, that the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman is without any justification in the previous course of the debate. But I will go a step further. It is impossible to ignore, when you are debating a Motion of this kind, the character of the measure itself, and the circumstances under which it is brought forward. I have never been an extreme believer in what is called the doctrine of mandate. I think that under normal conditions, if the country gives a majority to the Government of a particular political Party, it cannot complain if in the course of their term of office they do a good many things that were unexpected at the time they came in. Yes, that is the case under normal conditions. But this Parliament assembled under conditions that were entirely abnormal; and to justify that statement, which I do not make at random, I will recall to the attention of the House one or two of the declarations of the Prime Minister himself. The Prime Minister, speaking in the course of the election at Manchester. used this remarkable language. He said—

> "It was impossible that the country should at this moment have anything in its mind to exclude the paramount interest which events in South Africa necessarily excited. He asked them, whatever their politics might be, or to whatever Party in the State their allegiance had been given, to remember that this election did not turn on any of the old questions which had divided the electorate at previous elections, but it was a new issue governed by a new consideration."

Developing the same point, the same right hon. Gentleman the following night at Preston said to the electors there, speaking in support of one of his own followers—

> "It was not now a question of programmes of domestic legislation; it was a question of Imperial policy; and he could not imagine how any elector, be his previous political career what it might, could hesitate which of the two candidates he should support."

One more quotation, and one only, from a Gentleman who was at that time a Minister of almost equal authority with the Prime Minister himself, the right hon. Member for West Birmigham. He said—

> "He asked for the support, not only of those electors who were ordinarily with the Government for personal or Party reasons, but of patriots, who in a time of national danger put their patriotism before their Party."

This is the reward they are getting! The right hon. Gentleman went on, I am quoting from another speech—

> "In the North of England thousands and thousands of miners who have never voted Unionist before, and still call themselves Radicals and Liberals, on this occasion, even if it were only to be for this occasion, have supported the Unionist candidate. He did not say they had changed their views, they were probably Liberal and Radical as before, and would probably vote for Liberals and Radicals at the next election; but at this election they had voted for the Unionist candidate. Why did they do that?"

MR. JAMES O'KELLY (Roscommon, N.): Because they were fools.

MR. ASQUITH: That was not the answer which the right hon. Gentleman gave. He said it was—

> "Because they saw that the issue at the present time was not a question of domestic policy such as"—

he particularised—

> "Church discipline or liquor prohibition, but the question of the existence of the Empire."

Well, I might multiply these quotations *ad nauseam*, but I will not do so. because what I have read is, I think, quite sufficient to justify the proposition which I am laying down quite apart from any general doctrine of mandate. We have heard that the Parliament was elected in reliance, or very largely in reliance, on appeals of that kind. I have heard the right hon. Gentleman say, when an argument of this kind has been used before, "Oh, look at your own election addresses; did you not put forward a programme of social and domestic reform?" and so forth. Of course we did, but our programme was rejected, and because, as the right hon. Gentleman and the right hon. Member for West Birmingham said, not a few people who ordinarily voted Liberal and Radical, and were in favour of those programmes, deliberately set them aside in the belief that they were going to return a Parliament for a new purpose and for one purpose alone. And what is the state of things to-day? The majority secured in that way, in reliance upon those appeals, I might almost say upon those pledges—that majority, in probably the last session of an expiring Parliament, at any rate, in the fourth year of its existence, is being asked to revolutionise the law of licensing. [AN HON. MEMBER: No.] I am not going to discuss the merits of the Bill, but let me remind the hon. Gentleman who says "No" that the Government did, two years ago, in 1902, introduce a Licensing Bill. I think they had a perfect right to introduce it because it was practically a non-controversial measure. I agree there was no mandate for it, but it was a non-controversial measure, assented to very largely on both sides of the House; and it is incredible, if the Government in 1902 believed either that they had authority or that it was in the public interest to establish the licensing law on a totally new footing, that they would not have made some such proposal at that time. We know very well why the proposal was brought forward. It was done not because we were near the election of 1900, but because we are near the next election. It was done because, as the brewers and their friends showed very clearly last year, unless some legislation of this kind is brought forward it will not be a case of the good Liberals and Radicals voting under the stress of patriotic feeling for the Unionist candidate, but of the devoted followers of the Unionist Government, the publicans and brewers, voting under the stress of their own woes for the turning out of the Unionist Government and the substitution of a Liberal Government.

Now, I venture to assert, and I think the facts I have laid before you justify it, that, whether you look to the character of the discussion which has taken place, whether you look to the nature of the measure itself, or whether you look to the origin and position of the present House of Commons, the right hon. Gentleman's proposal is wholly unsupported by precedent and is a flagrant innovation of constitutional principle and practice. Here I come to what is, after all, the gravest aspect of the matter. We cannot look on this as an isolated proposal. The right hon. Gentleman, at the close of his speech, made some remarks about measures of this kind being necessary for the dignity and efficiency of the House of Commons. I confess I think political cynicism has rarely reached a higher level. I say so because this is only the latest, though I hope it may be the last, of the attempts which have been made under the right hon. Gentleman's initiative, or patronage, I care not which, in the last two years to stifle the voice and paralyse the action of the House of Commons. Parliamentary majorities come and go and Ministers come and go, but there is one thing which hitherto, at any rate, has persisted through all these chances and changes of Party fortune, and that has been the authority and the freedom of the House of Commons. That is a great permanent asset in our national balance-sheet, and it will be an evil day for the future of democracy in this country when the House of Commons comes to be regarded as a mere automatic machine for registering the edicts of a transient and, perhaps, a crumbling majority. What is the record of the present Government in this matter? What is the position in which they stand to-day? They are afraid either to face the country or to listen to the House of Commons. For twelve months the Leader of this House has exploited and exhausted all resources of our procedure to reduce us to a dumb show. Shift after shift, and manœuvre after manœuvre, have been applied to prevent our giving an open deliverance on the greatest of the issues of the day. Not content with that, the right hon. Gentleman, through the ingenuity of some of those who sit behind him, has contrived to erect, step by step, an impenetrable blockade against the free debate of almost every subject of importance. Now, to-day, as a fitting climax to the whole, we are to lose the power of effective criticism for the rest of the session in regard to the largest and most complex of all the proposals of the Government itself. Sir, is the House prepared, at the invitation of the right hon. Gentleman, to take this last step on the road to humiliation and impotence? I trust it is not; at any rate, it is to save ourselves from an ignominious surrender of our privileges, and to save those who come after us from a disastrous precedent, that I move the Amendment that stands in my name.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 1, to leave out all the words after the word 'That,' and insert the words 'this House declines to consider a proposal to deprive the House of Commons, without any justification in the previous course of the debate, of all power of reasonable and adequate discussion in respect of a measure which seeks, in the absence of any authority from the country, to make fundamental and much controverted changes in laws vitally affecting the well-being of the people.'"—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'the proceedings' stand part of the Question."

Mr. PIKE PEASE (Darlington) said he had listened with great interest to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman opposite, but he thought the majority of the House would agree that there had not been a single argument put forward to damage the case which the Prime Minister had put so clearly before the House in one of the greatest speeches he had ever delivered. With regard to the doctrine of mandate, he questioned whether any elector believed that when this Parliament was elected, he was electing a Parliament which would not legislate in the direction of domestic legislation. Everyone knew that Mr. Gladstone himself had fought an election with regard to one great matter and then introduced a number of controversial questions. They also knew that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Montrose Burghs had clearly stated that this Government was justified in legislating with regard to controversial matters. Anyone who had listened to the debates during the last few days would agree that many of the speeches had been made purely for obstructive purposes. [Ministerial cheers and Opposition cries of "Name."]

Everyone who had heard the speech of the hon. Member for Barnsley descriptive of his recent expedition would admit that it could not have been made except for some purpose of that kind. It was well known that Mr. Gladstone and Mr. John Bright were both in favour of compensation for publicans out of the rates, and it was extraordinary that the Party opposite now condemned the policy of getting that compensation out of the licensed victuallers themselves. He sincerely hoped that the House would by an overwhelming majority support the Motion of the Prime Minister.

Mr. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton) said that never in the history of Parliamentary procedure had such a drastic procedure been proposed on such flimsy pretences. In introducing it the Prime Minister had spoken of everything but the Resolution. He had spoken of the opportunities for criticism, but there were hosts of questions that the Government had brought forward which the Opposition could not criticise, and now forsooth, not content with that, the right hon. Gentleman asked the House in this matter to guillotine discussion and prevent it taking place. The whole justification put forward for this Resolution was that it was a most reasonable proposal on the part of the Government. He agreed with his right hon. friend the Member for Fife that such a Resolution applied to a Bill only introduced last April was the last despairing effort of a discredited Minister. What sort of commentary was this Resolution on the new Rules, upon which so much time had been spent in discussion, and which the right hon. Gentleman promised would add great dignity and much efficiency to the debates of this House. All the return they got for the time spent upon the new Rules was that the system of closure by compartments was more stringent than ever. This was the last despairing throw of a political gambler. Had it not been for the political exigencies of the Unionist Party the Licensing Bill would never have been introduced. They were told after the Licensing Bill of 1902 that the licensing laws of this country could not be bettered. Then what did this mean. It meant that the right hon. Gentleman's supporters, the brewers, were going to turn him out of office if he did not accede to their demands. What happened in the case of the Education Act. In that case there was closure by compartments; they were not allowed to discuss its vital provisions and the result was that the Act was not working harmoniously and the rates for education purposes were rising with alarming rapidity. There could be no finality in any legislation passed by this drastic method. No one would suggest that the Education Act was a final measure. It would be amended on the very first opportunity that was given to the country to express an opinion upon it, and no one believed that the Licensing Bill, if passed by means of the closure in this way, would finally settle the licensing difficulty. Another Government would come in at perhaps a not distant period and amend it. The right hon. Gentleman had now a measure before the House in regard to which he did not dare to call a public meeting in the country and in regard to which he was endeavouring to stifle discussion in the House itself, and yet they were told that the proposition before the House was reasonable. It was a perfect scandal to the Parliamentary procedure of this country.

This was one of the most important measures the right hon. Gentleman could deal with. What was the hurry for it. Surely there was no hurry at all, because if, as the right hon. Gentleman promised, the Government would be in power next session, they could bring this measure in then. If that were done the country would have an opportunity to consider it in the autumn. This was a most unreasonable proposition on the part of the right hon. Gentleman, because there had been nothing like obstruction. Members on the Unionist side of the House had over and over again appealed to the Government to make concessions, and the result of the right hon. Gentleman's shutting down discussion had been that those Gentlemen had voted in the Opposition lobby. In every one of the discussions on the education question the right hon. Gentleman had taunted the Opposition with being numerically small, but though the Opposition in the House had been numerically small in the country it had been numerically large. The right hon. Gentleman knew his majority was crumbling away. He did not want to carry the doctrine of mandate too far, but undoubtedly at the last election the electors were asked to vote on the question of the war. Since then, however, the Government had upset the education of the country, and had not won very much prestige thereby, and now they were trying to upset the whole licensing system by giving compensation where it had never before been granted and by interfering with the discretion of the licensing magistrates. In view of the fact that they now proposed to carry their Bill by the drastic method of the closure, every common-sense man should protest against their action to the utmost of his power.

SIR MARK STEWART (Kirkcudbrightshire) desired in a few words to explain why he intended to support the Motion of the Prime Minister. He was one of those who could not go all the way n supporting the policy of the Licensing Bill, but he intended to vote for the Motion, because he thought it was necessary to give the Government that power and influence in the House of Commons without which they could not carry on the business of the country. There could be no doubt that the House of Commons did not possess the prestige in the country it formerly enjoyed, and that was not due to any wrong-doings of the present Administration as hon. Members opposite seemed to think. He thought the mischief dated back to 1880–86. when the first marked difference was made in the treatment of the House, and the conduct of the then Government had left a far deeper impression on arliament than any act of any subsequent Administration. If the House was to have power to do its work they must pass the Resolution of the Prime Minister. It was ridiculous to say that the Bill could not be dealt with in six days. There were proposals in the Bill to which he was opposed, but he had no apprehension that he would be shut out by the Motion from stating his objections to them. The last speaker had had a good deal to say about the mandate of the last general election. He would remind the hon. Gentleman that whenever an election took place the candidates, in their addresses to the electors, dealt with a variety of matters which were of general interest but it was not to be expected that any man would exhaust the list of subjects of possible legislation during the life of a Parliament. It therefore did not follow that because a question was not mentioned in election addresses, it ought not to be dealt with by Parliament. In view of the near approach of the end of the session and of the large amount of business remaining to be transacted he thought they ought to give the Government the whole of the time of Parliament, not that they might get away for their holidays in good time but in order that they might secure that health and strength necessary to enable them to properly perform their duties to their constituents.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said the hon. Baronet the Member for Kirkcudbright had suggested there was no danger that Parliament would not be shut out from discussing questions of vital interest on the Bill. He would like to have the ruling of Mr. Speaker as to how far it would be in order to discuss, not the merits of the Bill, but the extent to which the Motion would shut out the consideration of parts of the Bill. He, for one, had up to the present taken no part in the discussion, either on the Second Reading of the Bill or in Committee. He had not put down a single Amendment, but there was one part of the measure on which he felt very strongly. So, too, did many of his constituents. It was a great mistake to suppose that the Bill was supported generally by the licensed victuallers. At certain pleasure resorts and in beautiful parts of the country, licensed victuallers held under conditions of tenure binding them to restrict the sale of intoxicating drinks. The principal hotel in his own constituency was held under a lease which directed the tenant to do his utmost to prevent the sale of these drinks. Yet these men who would gain nothing from the Bill were to be taxed under it. The Prime Minister had told them that under his plan the Bill would be adequately and fully discussed.

He added that it did not embody any novel or important principles.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am quite sure I never said that.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said if the right hon. Gentleman had used words he had not wished to, he would not hold him to them; but he had said also that the basis of compensation under the Bill had been before the House several times. His contention was that the Motion of the Prime Minister would have the effect of excluding the basis of compensation from discussion, because it was included in a portion of the Bill which had not yet been reached, and was not likely to be reached under the plan. He must repeat that, in the opinion of those who conducted licensed houses in pleasure resorts and beautiful places, the Bill would throw upon them an excessive charge. They were men who did not make profit out of drink; they got their living by entirely different means, and their grievance could not possibly be laid before the House if the Motion were carried; for the Motion would exclude from discussion the most difficult and complicated clauses of the Bill—the schedule, and the clauses affecting the schedule. The Prime Minister must bear in mind that the debates of this Bill had only extended over a few hours, and that the discussion throughout had been careful and business-like. Some of the most important parts of the Bill had not been reached, and it was because the Government proposal would prevent their discussion that he was opposed to it.

*MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.) said that, as a supporter of the Bill, he found himself quite unable to vote for the Motion. It was not because he thought that such a Motion was never justified, for he agreed with the Prime Minister that every case must be dealt with on its merits, and he was one of those who without hesitation supported the Resolution to enable the Government to bring to a more rapid close the debates on the Education Bill. But the circumstances of this case were entirely different. Up to the present he had made but one short speech on the Bill, because the points in which he was chiefly interested occurred in the latter part of the measure. He desired to see the Bill passed, if it were modified in certain important respects, so as to advance the cause of temperance. But at the present stage of the proceedings on the Bill, they were not warranted in taking any such drastic steps as were proposed in the Motion of the Prime Minister. With regard to the suggestion that the Bill had not been fairly discussed in Committee——

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I never suggested that.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): Then why this Resolution?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: If the hon. Gentleman listened to my speech, he would know. I carefully abstained from even suggesting that there was obstruction.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): Then why move this Motion?

MR. JOHN ELLIS: Then there was no obstruction?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It was absolutely unnecessary to my argument to say whether there was obstruction or not, and I did not suggest it.

*MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE: I made no reference to the right hon. Gentleman.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I thought you did.

*MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE said he would pass from that point, merely saying that the questions which had been discussed were important, and in his opinion an unreasonable amount of time had not been given to them. The fact that the closure had not been resorted to showed that the ordinary resources were not exhausted, and his contention was that in the interests of good legislation the necessity for this Resolution must be proved up to the hilt before it could be agreed to. The only strong or plausible reason for bringing forward the Resolution appeared to be the fact that they had now arrived at the month of July. But, after all, the Licensing Bill was the principal measure of the session, and very little time was given to its discussion in the month of June. Surely it was not very satisfactory from the point of view of Parliamentary business that one of the most important weeks in the session, in the middle of June, should be given up to the discussion of the details of a Bill such as the Scotch Education Bill, which might with common consent have been sent upstairs and discussed in a friendly and business-like manner. He felt strongly on the subject, because in certain quarters, and especially in certain newspapers, there was a tendency to bring discredit on Members of this House and their business-like capacity by suggesting that for social reasons they postponed their most important Parliamentary business. He sincerely hoped that no ground would be given for such suggestions. With regard to the character of the Bill, he sometimes thought the Government themselves did not rate the importance of the measure too highly. Many Members on the Government side thought it a measure of quite second rate importance for protecting a few publicans from a few cranky magistrates, but he believed it was far worse than that. The Bill went to the very root of the licensing system. It was an admission that the system of annual licences, which had prevailed for so many years, had practically broken down, and that it was necessary to introduce the recognition of a longer interest. It provided not only for compensation for the extinction of licences, but also for the creation of new licences under new terms. The measure excited very strong feeling in the country among many earnest men, both Churchmen and Nonconformists, Conservatives and Liberals, who believed that if the present occasion for the advancement of temperance reform were lost, it would be very difficult, with this Bill in operation, to advance that cause in the way they and, he believed, the majority of both sides in the House thought it ought to be advanced. For these reasons, if for no others, he thought the Bill was worthy of somewhat prolonged discussion.

What did the Government propose? Under the Resolution one day was to be given to the discussion of the conditions under which new licences should be granted, whether they should be annual or for a term of years, with or without compensation, whether the surrender of licences should be regarded as a legitimate or as an objectionable operation, and also the extent to which they should encourage the system which many people believed would turn out to be the most hopeful line of temperance reform, viz., the granting of licences to companies which had a disinterested view as to profits. All these matters would have to be discussed within the limits of one Parliamentary day. Under these circumstances did it not stand to reason that legislation in this House became somewhat of a farce? He could not help regarding the proposal as a severe blow not only to the power of private Members but also to the credit of the House of Commons. He protested against the general system of Parliamentary procedure, under which matters were allowed to drift—he did not refer to any particular Government more than another—during the first three quarters of the session, and a huge mass of undigested legislation was forced through in the dog days, sent up to the other House in the month of August, when it could not possibly receive proper consideration, and this House was held responsible for the exact form in which that legislation was turned out. Measures such as that now proposed should be the last resource in extreme cases. The ordinary closure ought to be tried first. If things were as bad as the Prime Minister had stated, let the Standing Orders be altered so that all measures were sent upstairs for consideration in detail by Grand Committee. That was a strong measure, but it would be justified if matters were as bad as his right hon. friend had described. At the worst he suggested there should be an autumn session. That would be extremely hard on members of the Government, but he thought it ought to be resorted to before the House decided to omit all discussion of important principles and questions in a Bill which excited great public interest throughout the country.

There was one other consideration which might well be considered by his hon. friends. In this Resolution were they not forging a grand weapon for a future Radical Government? He could not conceive Governments with a large popular majority behind them, anxious to make the best use of their time, bringing forward a number of drastic proposals, and, by a Resolution similar to that under discussion, forcing those proposals through at the point of the bayonet. It would not do for his hon. friends to rely too much on the other House. If a Radical leader brought forward a scheme for imposing additional taxation on land, or further taxes on public-houses—a very likely consequence of passing the present Bill as it stood—there would be no appeal to another place. This Resolution was therefore a most dangerous weapon, and was not warranted by the circumstances. As to the Bill itself, if no reasonable facilities were given for discussing the various important questions which remained, many of those who voted in favour of the Bill on the Second Reading would have to consider very gravely whether they should not take a different course on the Third Reading.

*Sir JOHN LENG (Dundee) said that as he had not contributed to the discussion on the Bill he might say a word as to the genesis of the measure. It seemed to him that it was entirely in the brewers' vat. By the Amendment of which he had given notice he had intended directing attention to the almost complete absence of a public demand for the measure. The Report on Public Petitions just presented gave the figures from 2nd February to 24th June. It appeared that the number of Petitions against the Bill had been 6,659, with 224,872 signatures, while only one Petition, with 253 signatures, had been presented in favour of the Bill. Moreover, there had been 3,394 Petitions, with 55,064 signatures, against the alteration of the law with regard to the renewal of licences, which was the main proposal of the measure. Hence there had been 10,000 Petitions, with 300,000 signatures, presented against the Bill, and only one, with 253 signatures, in its favour—a fact which, if any regard whatever was to be paid to Petitions, should carry some weight with the right hon. Gentleman. He had also directed the attention of the

Prime Minister to a declaration signed by the heads of all our Universities, and the heads of settlements in the East End, both male and female, who had devoted their lives to this most important work for the betterment of the working classes in the East End. All these people were most earnestly and seriously interested in the social welfare of the people, and he asked the Prime Minister whether, after receiving such declarations signed by persons of great influence and authority, he had modified his views upon this Bill. The right hon. Gentleman had said that he could not understand how temperance reformers, if they desired a reduction of licences, could take the attitude they did. They were all in favour of the reduction of licences, and a large number of them were in favour of the principle of compensation, but what they strongly objected to was that this Bill placed a limitation upon the discretion of the magistrates, a discretion which they had enjoyed for centuries.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member is going into the merits of the Bill.

*SIR JOHN LENG: The opposition to this Bill came from all quarters, and from many social organisations. Reference had been made to the protest of the Bishops; but the right hon. Gentleman paid very little regard to that. This Bill had been put forward as a measure of temperance reform, but he would remind the House that the National Temperance Federation had recently passed a Resolution entering its indignant protest against the proposal of the Prime Minister to apply closure by compartments to the Licensing Bill, and the Resolution invited the House of Commons to vote against this attempt to curtail the discussion of a measure of such vital importance to the community. So far as the opinions of the masses of the people were concerned, the right hon. Gentleman did not think much of them, and he did not appear to think much of the recent Hyde Park demonstration. There had been demonstrations against the Bill all over the country. The demonstration in Hyde Park was held by the working people themselves, who knew how much they were affected by this question. But, however much the right hon. Gentleman might disregard the masses of the people now, when the time came he would find that he would have been much wiser if he had disregarded the menaces of the brewers and publicans and paid some regard to the opinions of the people. He regretted that the Prime Minister had shown so little consideration to ethical, social, and philanthropic influences. From a political point of view it might be well for the right hon. Gentleman to use this closure to stop debate in the House, but by so doing he was only arousing a stronger feeling against the Government throughout the entire country. When the time came for the right hon. Gentleman to submit his policy to the country, he would find that not only in regard to this measure, but also in regard to the Education Bill and other measures, and in his attempt to reduce representation in the House of Commons to a mere nullity and make it a mere machine for recording the decisions of the Cabinet he had entirely miscalculated the views of the people in this matter.

*MR. EMMOTT (Oldham) said his right hon. friend the Member for East Somersetshire had told the House the reasons why he was unable to support the Resolution moved by the First Lord of the Treasury. The hon. Member was a man of ability and of experience, he spoke with authority, and was respected on both sides of this Assembly. The reasons which the hon. Member advanced for the course he proposed to take were reasons with which he entirely agreed. He proposed to comment briefly on only two of them. There were two specific cases that the right hon. Gentleman had mentioned in which the Government had either made mistakes or might have, by a different arrangment of business, given reasonable and adequate opportunity of discussion with regard to the Licensing Bill, always supposing they regarded the measure as one of first class importance. The right hon. Gentleman complained of the mismanagement of the business of the House in the past, as, for instance, in Ascot week, when they brought forward the Scotch Education Bill, a Bill which might have been sent to a Grand Committee, and thus have reduced the time occupied by the House. Again, if the Government really desired to get this Licensing Bill, why did they not have an autumn session for it as they did in the case of the Education Bill? Surely, if they attached so much importance to the Bill, they should give time for its adequate discussion, and not force it through after totally inadequate attention by the House. It had been asked why the House of Commons had not now the same authority in the country as it had in the past. He was found to say that the House had lost its authority chiefly during the period that the Government of the country had been Conservative and Unionist. He did not, however, attach particular importance to that. The question was whether that loss of authority was from a permanent or a temporary cause. He did not think the House need be so despondent as they sometimes were in this matter. There had been two changes in the conduct of business in the House. One was that the present Prime Minister attended much less in the House during debates than any of his predecessors, and that fact had a great influence upon business. The other was that the measures of the Government were unstatesmanlike. As to the opposition given from the Liberal side to the Education Act, it was perfectly justified by the fact that the Act was not working satisfactorily in the country, and that one part of the country was practically in open revolt against it. The Opposition called the Education Bill an unstatesmanlike measure, and he thought they would be found in the course of history to have been justified in that view, and therefore lengthy opposition to it must be allowed to have been justified.

The real question was, could the House give adequate discussion to the Licensing Bill in the time allowed by the Motion of the Prime Minister? He did not think they could, because they had never been able to come to grips upon the question yet. It took some days for one side of the House to appreciate the position of the other side, and he felt sure that the Prime Minister had not that grasp of the views of the opponents of the Bill which he would have if he attended the debates regularly. He agreed with the Prime Minister when he said he did not regard precedent as of much importance. It must be remembered in reference to the precedents which arose during the period of the Liberal Administration that after all there was a consideration of some importance affecting Liberal measures which did not appertain to those measures emanating from a Tory Administration. That consideration was that there was a House of Lords which, when a Liberal Government was in office, was more or less a deliberative Assembly, but which he thought in the case of a Unionist Government did to some extent abdicate its functions. He thought that the precedents of previous Unionist Governments with regard to the proposal now before the House were wholly and entirely against the Prime Minister. He did not set great store on precedents. As the Prime Minister had said, they must decide each question on its merits. There was no question that the matters dealt with by the Licensing Bill did require discussion. The Bill referred to one of the most important social questions of the day. There was no disputing the fact that the considerations connected with licensing were amongst the most complex relating to any social question of the time. Having regard to the enormous amount of misery and crime which resulted from the undue use of intoxicating liquors, there was no doubt that this was an important and complex measure. This Bill attempted to introduce a new system and to fix a perpetuity of tenure for licence-holders hitherto unknown to the law. It did so on the ground of justice, but it seemed to him that the justice stopped at the brewers. There was no justice for the public and very little for the publican in the Bill as drawn. These were matters which required the close scrutiny of the House, and to which the House could not give adequate attention if the Resolution of the Prime Minister were passed.

He did not wish to press the question of the mandate to any undue length, but he must point out in regard to a moribund Government, like this, bringing forward a question of great complexity which was extremely obnoxious to many temperance reformers, that the only way they could bring home the facts of the situation to the public was by prolonged discussion in this House, and that was prevented utterly and entirely by the system of closure by compartments. In any system of closure by compartments, and still more in a drastic system of this kind, it was impossible to exercise any pressure upon the Government, for they had only to sit tight during debate and then bring their supporters into the division lobby and they got what they wanted. If they had a reasonably prolonged debate Members on both sides had a chance of pressing their views upon the Government, but under the closure system that was impossible. Without desiring to be offensive to right hon. Gentlemen opposite, he felt compelled to take objection to the way in which the Bill had been conducted. It was not too much to claim for previous Liberal Administrations which had brought legislation before the House that they had on the whole, particularly in regard to their important measures, only put them in the hands of men who had thoroughly studied the subject. He thought the House had some right to complain about the way in which it had been treated by Ministers in regard to this Bill. The Bill was nominally in charge of the Home Secretary, whose efforts in regard to the measure had been mostly noted for his observance of the principle of golden silence ; the right hon. Gentleman had taken, if he might use a vulgar phrase, a back seat in the discussion, and that was a great drawback to the House. Now he came to the Solicitor-General. He noticed the Solicitor - General had had principal charge of the measure. The Opposition would rather deal with him so long as he had adequate power. But over and over again, when he appeared to be meeting them in debate, he was thrown over by the Prime Minister. That operated against efficient legislation in the House. As to the Prime Minister he hoped he did not do him an injustice, but as far as he had followed his speeches in regard to the question, he had never studied it fully and thoroughly. He had heard with a ready ear the complaints of the brewers, but he was absolutely ignorant, as the right hon. Gentleman himself had confessed, of the grave and injurious scandals in his own constituency in regard to the licensing system. He did not complain of the Prime Minister's ignorance except in so far as he had shown his mind was open to one side of the question, and totally closed to the other. That was not the way to get adequate legislation in the House. He thought it ought to be stated in defence of the Home Secretary, that he had another heavy Bill on his hands in Grand Committee. But everyone of His Majesty's Ministers appeared to come to the House with a mind overworked, and distraught by many other questions, and they could not give adequate attention to this great and complex social question which it deserved. No single one of them appeared to have studied, or attempted to study, this most important Bill, as Sir Robert Peel and Mr. Gladstone studied the great measures which they introduced. An hon. Gentleman laughed, because he thought the comparison was not one which could, with any justice, be made. Under these circumstances, it was clear that the Liberal Party must absolutely refuse all responsibility for this Bill. If this Motion was carried they must pledge themselves to reverse it at the first possible moment. They must make it perfectly clear that they did not accept the principle of perpetuity of tenure on any terms, and they would see who was going to win this fight in the long run.

He had only one word to say in conclusion as to the discussion of this question in detail. They had spent two days—fifteen or sixteen hours in all—in the discussion of the time limit raised on a false issue. The Prime Minister might have helped them out of the difficulty, and they might have been able to discuss the time limit in the way they desired if the right hon. Gentleman had not thought it his duty to his Party to chip in at a certain moment and take care that the discussion should take place then, when it was more convenient to the Government, inasmuch as it brought in the question of the time limit in regard to other matters besides compensation. They spent a few hours over the question of the tied houses and that was closured by the Government. They spent a good many hours over the disciplinary question. Hon. Members did not realise the importance of that question until it was discussed in Committee, and that showed the value of having adequate discussion. By discussion they got into the heart of a subject, and they did not know really before they began what were going to be the important and what the unimportant points. On Clauses 2 and 3 there were six or eight questions — he need not enumerate them—of very great importance, any one of which would occupy in the ordinary course at least one day's discussion. They were all put into one day by the Prime Minister's Resolution. They could not get reasonable legislation on such a principle as that. But most serious of all was the wider question of the degradation of the House of Commons. He admitted that the closure under modern circumstances must too often be necessary. They all admitted that the closure in itself had a bad effect. He believed that in wise hands the closure might be worked in a way that in the long run would obtain the sanction of the country. But here was a Government which after all was regarded—he did not say on this question but in regard to another question—with great suspicion by two important groups of Members—he supposed they were one half of the nominal supporters of the Government. A Government of that kind which was on its last legs, and which was bringing forward a measure of this importance and complexity on a violently controversial subject, now came in with this closure Resolution in order to make it sure that the House would not get adequate discussion of it. He had only to say that such a course was an outrage on the decencies of debate, and it seemed to him the last despairing effort to capture, at any rate, that portion of the vote which the publican could turn.

Mr. DISRAELI (Cheshire, Altrincham) said the hon. Member for Oldham was hardly fair to the Prime Minister when he said the right hon. Gentleman was unaware of the gross scandals which had occurred in his own constituency. The introduction of this Bill hardly bore out what the hon. Gentleman said. Everybody knew that the scandals of Manchester were the beerhouses which infested that city.

Mr. EMMOTT: Allow me to explain to the hon. Member that I referred to the fact that certain magistrates were influenced by the trade in some way or other, and tried to interfere with the work of the police. Evidently the hon. Member does not know of that, or that they were struck off the Bench.

Mr. DISRAELI said he knew that, but he thought the hon. Gentleman was referring to the state of licensing in Manchester which the Prime Minister by introducing this Bill aimed at doing away with. The worst class of licensed houses were the ante-1869 beerhouses, and he did not think the hon. Gentleman had any reason to hold up the Prime Minister to any extraordinary opprobrium in connection with the introduction of this Bill.

Mr. EMMOTT: I have explained the reason for what I said.

Mr. DISRAELI said he was one of those who voted against the closure on the Home Rule and on the Education Bill, and it was not with a very happy conscience that he should give his vote that day. But he considered that after twelve years in that House one's ideals got rather upset. In this matter one was led, perhaps, more to consider, not the immediate, but the ultimate benefit to the country which would result from the course the Government were now taking. He entirely denied what had been said over and over again in the debate, and especially on the other side—that this was a very difficult and complex measure. The position of the magistrates, to his mind, was left very nearly the same as at the present moment. Their rights and duties were left practically as they were now. Each county and each town would now be able to do away with public-houses which were not required. He thought the result of this Bill would be so beneficial that he would vote for the closure Resolution of the Government, though, perhaps, that action had been taken before it ought to have been taken.

It had been said on the other side that there had been no opposition to the passage of the Bill which had not been fair. He thought the principle of the Bill was contained in the first five or six lines. They discussed that on the Second Reading for several days, and it had also been discussed in Committee. The House having once accepted the principle, the Bill to his mind was one which could be passed, leaving the machinery as it was now to be administered by quarter sessions. The argument that much of the machinery of the Bill would not be discussed if the Resolution now before the House were passed was not a strong one, because most of the machinery was to be carried out by quarter sessions themselves. The principle of the Bill having been accepted he ventured to think that the Government were, perhaps, not doing such a wrong thing as some might consider in forcing the closure at this early stage. He thought the Government might have given a little more time for the discussion of the Bill. He did not mean the sort of discussion that had come from the other side. He did not mean a controversy between brewers and teetotalers and lawyers, but discussion on the issues with which the magistrates would have to deal in their administrative capacity. The fact that it had come to pass that the closure had to be enforced in the way proposed was, to his mind, one of the many condemnations of the new rules of procedure passed by the House. It had been clearly shown that the House could not sit four or five days continuously on a big Bill without hon. Members being placed in a condition of almost physical ineptitude and unfitness to do the work. He hoped the Prime Minister would consider that the surrendering of the Wednesday evening had placed the House in that position. The new Rules had absolutely broken down. To his mind this was a detestable action to take, but it had been adopted before; it had been initiated by the other side. In this case, although he had never voted for closure by compartments before, he would vote for this closure because he believed that the benefit to the country would be greater than the disadvantage or harm done to the House of Commons.

MR. LAWSON WALTON (Leeds, S.) said that the hon. Member who had just sat down had recognised the extreme importance of the Motion now before the House. He had pointed out that it did not involve the mere question of the fate of the Bill which the House was now engaged in discussing, but that it involved the constitutional position and capacity, in its legislative sphere, of the House of Commons, and, if passed, it would establish a precedent which, in the hands of successive Governments, would be used to curtail, to the point of destruction, the exercise of the deliberative functions of the House in framing its legislation. Here they had a Bill, not unduly long, and not unduly complicated, but highly controversial. There seemed to be no ground for putting this measure into an exceptional category, except that it excited strong feeling in the country, which was reflected on these Benches of the House of Commons. There had been no waste of time involved in its discussion during the few hours devoted to it; and if, under the circumstances, they were to come to the conclusion that the machinery of theHouse of Commons was to be acknowledged to be unequal to the strain of framing the measure, then there was no highly contentious Bill to which, in the future, the same argument might not be applied with equal force. He would ask the House for one moment to look at the practical result of this Motion. Were they, or were they not, prepared to declare that, as a body, the House was unfitted to frame its measures? He agreed that that did not involve the declaration that they were unable to define the principles of these measures, because to some extent these were settled by the debate on the Second Reading of the Bills. But the Motion declared when a Bill passed into Committee, if time was short, or if the measure was controversial, or if any elements of complication arose, it was to be taken, not in the form in which Parliament had settled it, but in the form in which the Government draftsman had framed it, and in which the Cabinet had chosen to adopt it? The Constitution had undergone a serious change. It was said that it had ceased to be government by Parliament. It had become government by Cabinet, and an even later development, they were told, had taken place, and it was now government by Prime Minister in Cabinet, little distinguishable from the autocracies into which the democracies of the past had degenerated.

But the present point was not so much the authority of the Cabinet or the Prime

Minister in the Cabinet. The question was one which was very near to every one of them, whether they were the enemies of this Government, or any other Government. It was a question for every individual Member of Parliament who was proud of the institution to which he belonged, whether or not the House was to surrender the function of giving its impress, after debate and deliberation, on the form of the measures which it passed. Everyone recognised that the miserable six days which were to be allotted to discussing the clauses of this Bill would involve that whole clauses would be taken *en bloc*, by some haphazard method; and that other Amendments of the greatest importance, owing to the mechanical application of what the Prime Minister called the time limit, would be shut out; and that they would send to the country a Bill which here and there might reflect the opinion of this House, but here and there would reflect no opinion except that of the Cabinet draftsman. He had had some little experience of the criticism to which Acts of Parliament had of late years been subjected by those whose duty it was to administer them, and the strongest language had been used in regard to the ill-adapted framework by which Parliament had chosen to express its will in the direction towards which legislation tended. It must be remembered there was no tribunal by means of which Bills might be revised and criticised. They became law after passing through Committee. If they had a body of experts who could review and revise legislation, they might have some security, but the only security which Parliament had was in the discussion and deliberation of this House, and if they came to the conclusion that that deliberation and discussion could not be expended on their measures, then they were abandoning one of the most important functions which this House had hitherto exercised. What steps was it proposed to take? The Prime Minister was all for huggermugger methods. The Prime Minister said: "Let the business spin out in a happy-go-lucky way until the allotted period is reached," and when the allotted period arrived, however important the clauses might be, deliberation must be curtailed by this mechanical limit of the compartment. The time limit of the Prime Minister was Procrustean in its application, and the result would be that they would cast upon the country a half-considered and ill-digested measure in respect to which there had been no adequate discussion. The Prime Minister said that Parliament was going to be degraded by the length of time that was expended in the discussion of measures of this kind. But was not the true degradation to be found in the declaration, which they were, in effect, making that Parliament was unequal to the discharge of its constitutional duties?

The Prime Minister had said that they could not in Committee adequately discuss the measures they were to pass; but if that were so, it was the duty of the Prime Minister to offer a true solution of the difficulty. If the situation had arisen that they could not adequately discuss measures in Committee, by whom were they to be discussed? Was a measure to be sent out to the country unconsidered, because, owing to the lackadaisical conduct of the business at an early period of the session, the time which might have been usefully spent on a measure of first-rate importance had been otherwise absorbed? He contended that if that was the present situation of this House as a deliberative assembly, then it was for the Prime Minister as the Leader of the House to substitute for the abandoned functions of the House some other method of adequately considering and deciding upon the framework of their legislation. He did not approach the consideration of this question in any Party sense. This was a precedent which would be established from which there would be no escape. Closure by compartments would be applicable in the future to any Bill. The Prime Minister might get up and say: "This is a highly controversial measure. The time at the disposal of Parliament is limited. It must be passed. The Committee stage must be abridged, and we shall ask the House to send this Bill forth without discussion." The precedent arising out of this debate would be quoted with irresistible force in order to induce their successors to agree to such a Motion.

He could quite understand the Prime Minister making this Motion if there had been anything in the nature of obstruction to this Bill. But the criticism of the measure had proceeded from both sides, and nearly every Amendment which had been moved had been received with sympathetic consideration by the Solicitor-General, who represented the Government. There was scarcely an Amendment which had not been regarded as most reasonable, and in one case, after a large amount of time had been consumed in its discussion, the Solicitor-General came forward with a very important Amendment which he himself put before the Committee. How was the Prime Minister to predict that similar cases might not happen again? What was thought of as mere machinery was apt to involve questions of principle. Was the door to be closed to all fruitful suggestions and modifications or improvements, because forsooth they would not sit after twelve, or because they must have their holidays on the 12th August? The fate of the House of Commons as a deliberative assembly was at stake. The declaration of the Prime Minister that the House would not sit after 12 o'clock at night, or prolong the session beyond the middle of August, to discuss a measure of such prime importance, was a degradation of Parliament, and the right hon. Gentleman who made it would be held responsible for the feeling it would cause in the country. He felt strongly on this matter, and he offered these observations in no Party sense whatever. He hoped that hon. Members on the Government Benches would lift this issue above Party, and say to the Prime Minister: "We think you are mistaken; we are prepared to come and prepared to stay to discuss this measure, which has aroused such popular feeling throughout the country—a measure of which it must not be said outside that Parliament grudged adequate time for its consideration."

SIR JOHN GORST (Cambridge University) said that with the Party aspect of the question at issue he should have nothing to do. He had listened with admiration to the excellent speeches of the First Lord of the Treasury and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fifeshire; and his memory was irresistibly carried back to days when he had heard the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fifeshire make a speech from the Treasury Bench exactly like that of the First Lord of the Treasury, and the First Lord of the Treasury make a speech from the Front Opposition Bench precisely like that of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fifeshire. His object in rising was to protest most earnestly against the application of the principle of closure by compartments to social legislation. He had listened with great pain to the confession of the First Lord of the Treasury that the House was practically incapable of carrying through a measure of social legislation, and that, too, in the case of a Bill where there had been no undue discussion, where even the First Lord of the Treasury himself repudiated the notion that there had been anything like obstruction.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No; I abstained from saying that there was obstruction.

SIR JOHN GORST: At all events the right hon. Gentleman does not venture to allege that there has been obstruction.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: My right hon. friend must not put it in that way either. I was quite ready to allege it if it was necessary to the argument I addressed to the House. It was not necessary, and therefore I did not allege it.

SIR JOHN GORST said he would put it in this way—that in relation to a measure the consideration of which he ventured to allege had been characterised by extremely business-like debate, the First Lord of the Treasury had said that it was impossible for the House adequately to carry on discussion in Committee. Surely, if that declaration of the First Lord was recorded by the adoption of this Resolution, it might be said that the House of Commons had written itself down as incapable, under its existing Rules, of passing an ordinary measure of social reform. Now, would the House consider how these Bills which dealt with the social habits and conditions of the people were framed? They were sometimes prepared in accordance with the Report of a Royal Commission or of a Select Committee, in which event all interests had, at least, an opportunity of being heard. The Bill was therefore prepared with some knowledge of the various points of controversy and with the various interests that had to be considered. But that was not the case with the Licensing Bill. That measure did not follow either the Majority or the Minority Report of the Royal Commission. It was a Bill framed by the Government itself. It would be framed by a number of gentlemen selected haphazard, who necessarily had no greater knowledge of the subject of legislation than anybody else, assisted by permanent officials in the Civil Service, who also were selected at haphazard and who, again, had not particular expert knowledge of the subject under consideration. There were, no doubt, powerful interests and powerful influences who managed somehow or other to get a say in the preparation of Government Bills; but even the most careful Government could never feel certain that all interests had been considered and that all the points in connection with the Bill had been brought under review. No doubt the Bill would be exposed to discussion, but he did not know whether the closure had not been imposed even in the Cabinet itself. Then, finally, the Bill was submitted to the House of Commons. Now, what he wanted to impress on the House was that here, on the floor of this House, for the first time an opportunity was given to every interest involved in the Bill of being heard, and every difficulty had an opportunity of being raised. Had the Government had an opportunity of really considering the operation of their own Bill? Had the Minister in charge of the Bill, who ought to be a person of authority trusted by his colleagues, had an opportunity of so modifying the original proposals of the Government in accordance with the principles laid down, so as to make it acceptable to the House of Commons, and to remove from it the deficiencies which had been shown to exist, and to finally pass through the House of Commons a measure that would be acceptable not only to the Party to which the Government belonged, but to the country at large, and which would work for the benefit of the whole people? In this Bill, he thought, they had an excellent example of the value of discussions in the House, because, during the short time it had been under discussion, he ventured to say that the Solicitor-General had learned a great deal about the licensing laws of this country in their social aspect which he had never known before. The right hon. and learned Gentleman had received criticisms from both sides of the House with great sympathy and consideration and had accepted important Amendments; and he believed that the right hon. and learned Gentleman would have been disposed to accept more Amendments if his zeal had not been curtailed by the First Lord of the Treasury.

Now, what would be the effect of the proposal of the Government? It would undoubtedly be that the Licensing Bill would be passed into law with a great number of points, perhaps points of detail, but of important detail, greatly affecting the happiness of the people and their moral welfare, which had not been submitted to the judgment of the House or had not received the independent criticism of the House, and without the Government having had an opportunity of correcting the procedure. In fact the Bill would rather resemble one of those foreign legislative propositions which went by the name of "ukases," passed not in concert with the representatives of the people, but solely by permanent officials of the Government, and which consequently were not only not obeyed by the people, but gave rise to revolutionary sentiments and occasionally to the assassination of some unpopular Minister. From incidents such as these, this country was happily free, and chiefly because legislation was submitted to free discussion in the House of Commons. The results of a procedure such as was now proposed were apparent in the fact that so many of the Acts dealing with the social condition of the people had by their authors to be made the subjects of amending Bills. Why, even the Education Bill, with the general principles of which he was in entire accord, would have been better if it had been thoroughly discussed in the House, and many other matters which had been decided under closure would have been better had there been full discussion and expression of opinion. On the whole he did not think that there was any real saving of time. Looking beyond the session, no saving of Parliamentary time resulted from Motions such as these; an enormous amount of time would be saved, now spent on amending Bills, if more care were given to the original measures. He was inclined to think that it would be better not to attempt to pass any social legislation at all until the rules of procedure were amended so as to secure that social legislation, at least, should not pass without full discussion. The Prime Minister mentioned the alternative, only to dismiss it, of amending the rules of procedure; but the House would do well to amend them so as to ensure adequate discussion for every social measure. It would not be in order for him to mention particular projects, but in this connection he was a strong supporter of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, who had often advocated the appointment of a strong business Committee, something like the Committee of Selection, chosen from both sides of the House and composed of the older Members, not so much influenced by Party considerations—a strong business Committee to allocate the time to be occupied in various discussions. He could not enlarge upon this idea, but at least it would save the House from the absurdity of attempting to pass social legislation when under its Rules the House might be incapacitated from discussion.

*MR. WHITTAKER (Yorkshire, W.R., Spen Valley) said he confessed he approached the consideration of the Motion with a strong feeling of indignation, and could not discuss general procedure with the philosophic calm of the right hon. Gentleman who had just spoken. From a Party point of view, no more favourable Motion for the Liberal side of the House could be made. The Prime Minister smiled, but he must not suppose that they were incapable of looking at the question from any but a Party point of view. The Bill had created a remarkably strong feeling throughout the country altogether apart from that section of the community with which he might be considered to be specially identified; and that a measure of such gross injustice should be forced through the House by a method of closure absolutely unparalleled in Parliamentary history would, from the Party point of view, suit the Liberal Party well. But they did not need it. The country was indignant enough with the Government already. It was sick of the Government and needed not this additional stimulus to its indignation. The long dissertation of the Prime Minister upon business was beside the mark. The whole trouble arose from the right hon. Gentleman's mismanagement, from his waste of time early in the session, and his attempt to crowd business into the latter part of the session. The right hon. Gentleman said that the only complaint would be if the Government had proposed a great number of measures. Surely there was another source of complaint. Why did not the right hon. Gentleman use the early weeks and month of the session to get on with the business and not have it now crowded together because of his bungling and mismanagement? Why did not the Government bring in the Bill earlier? Before Parliament met there was every indication that the Bill would be introduced almost immediately after the conclusion of the debate on the King's Speech; but never in the recent history of Parliament had Government Bills been introduced so late. There was a two-fold reason. In the first place, the Prime Minister could not rely on his supporters for the working of the Parliamentary machine. Yes it was; but not because they wanted to discuss measures adequately, but because hon. Members would not attend to their Parliamentary duties; they had to be dragged to the House to vote for the closure. Time was wasted because Members would not return after dinner, wasted by the week that Members might go to Ascot. With his lackadaisical supporters the Prime Minister had mismanaged business, had lowered the character of Parliamentary representation, and now came down to closure debate in a ruthless manner.

Hitherto it had been the custom, of which they had reason to be proud, to accept social legislation because the country was assured it had been freely discussed, and because it had been customary to carry even controversial measures, more or less, by consent. There had always been a definite and deliberate intention on the part of the Government to meet, as far as possible, objection; and the Opposition were always given a fair opportunity of expressing their objections. But on no such ground would the Licensing Bill be accepted. It was a measure full of vital changes; it was not merely a compensation Bill. That was not the main object. The main object was to deprive the justices of discretionary powers they had exercised for something like four centuries. If the inner history of the Bill were known, it would be found that the original scheme was to curtail the power of the justices. Now that was to be done indirectly. It was a vitally important matter touching the interests of the whole nation. The licensing question had wrecked powerful Ministries and baffled the efforts of the most astute statesmen, and to ask the Committee to deal with such a Bill in half-a-dozen days was an outrage upon Parliament. The Government had found the greatest difficulty in drafting their measure. It had been drafted and redrafted a dozen times, and if those gentlemen who had to consider the subject without any special knowledge, and having consulted the representatives of one party to the controversy only, found such difficulty, how, with any show of reason, could the Government attempt to force it down the throat of the House of Commons without any adequate opportunity for discussion. The main points of the Bill had not been discussed. Clauses 2 and 3 would settle the whole basis and method of compensation, and was that so simple a matter that it could be disposed of in a day? They would have to settle the method of ascertaining the value and by whom it was to be ascertained; and what was more important, how the money was to be divided. The proposals of the Bill as to the division of the money were simply outrageous. They were that those who provided the money would not get it, and that those who got the money would not provide it. There were also the important questions of the tenant's title to make deductions and of the borrowing powers under the Bill. All that to be squeezed into a single Parliamentary day! It was ludicrous. In one day also they had to lay down a basis for a new system of granting licences in connection with an entire revolution in the system as to old licences. And for the rest of the clauses and the schedule and the new clauses of the Government and everything else—one day. Clause 6, which was one of the most extraordinary clauses ever proposed in any Bill, would put into the hands of the Home Secretary the power and the duty of framing rules for carrying the Act into effect, so that this was not even legislation by the Cabinet or by the Prime Minister; it was to be legislation by the Home Secretary. Never had there been a Licensing Bill presented to the House before in which the fullest provision was not made for indicating the duties to be done under the Bill and the conditions under which they were to be discharged. But the whole of this Bill was to be put into operation by the Home Secretary, and he did not understand a word of it. Was Parliament to have no voice? Either the Government was not quite clear in its own mind or this was a new system of closure to keep from the House the opportunity of discussing these details. The arrangement of Clause 6 to hand over to a Government Department matters that ought to settled on the floor of the House was preposterous and an outrage on the House of Commons.

Reference had been made to what other Ministers would do if this Resolution were made a precedent, but Liberal Administrations had no protection in another place, and might as well rely on the Carlton Club to pass their measures. They had to depend entirely upon the strength of their own position in this House. They had no protection in another place as hon. Members opposite had. Why was this particular Bill selected for such treatment? Why was everything giving way to the brewers' Bill? Why not go on with the Valuation Bill? Why not go on with the Port of London Bill? It was a great injustice to the traders of London that they should be kept in a state of uncertainty. The only other measure the Prime Minister said he would put through was the Welsh Coercion Bill. No measures for the interests of the people were to be passed; only measures in the interests of a class. The real truth of the matter was that the Prime Minister and the Government of the day were in the hands of a trade. Their Parliamentary life depended on the vote of those in that House who were interested in the trade. These Members could cut the thread which held them from going over the precipice of a general election. In a division the other day, when their majority was only thirty-eight, there were fifty Members voting for the Government who were actually interested in the liquor trade. But for these votes their fate could be decided at any moment on such divisions as had taken place. They were between the devil and the deep sea. They knew the fate that was before them, and dare not face it. Let the Prime Minister act the part of a man. It must be a pitiable position to be in—to be brought to the heel of the liquor trade by a crack of the whip. Ministers were depending on a trade whose motto was "Our trade, our politics," and had, as was avowed by the Home Secretary, brought in this Bill to protect a trade that had no higher political ideal than its own greed, its own selfishness. Yes, and the Prime Minister in his own constituency was more at the mercy of that trade than many. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University had referred to the great influence and interest that can have access to a Government. Some reference had been made to Manchester scandals. He would be the last man to suggest that the Prime Minister would knowingly lend himself in any way whatever to anything that he knew to be unworthy; but he might be, he ventured to think he had been, surrounded by influences which had brought about proposals which were unworthy, without his knowledge that they were so. [AN HON. MEMBER: Question.] [HON. MEMBERS: What influences?] This was a question of the influence which was at work in inducing the Government to select this particular measure to be pressed forward by most arbitrary means, and it was the question. He was asked "What influences?" What was it that induced the Prime Minister to knight Sir John Mark of Manchester and to confer a decoration on the chief constable?

MR. CUST (Southwark, Bermondsey): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask if it is in order to make a personal attack on a Cabinet Minister.

*MR. SPEAKER: It is often done and is not necessarily out of order. But the hon. Member is travelling beyond the question before the House. It is a question of relevance.

*MR. WHITTAKER said he had carefully guarded himself in what he had said. It was most undesirable for a Prime Minister to be surrounded by a number of gentlemen who did bring influence to bear upon him and put a matter before him in one way only, so as to lead to results that were disastrous and discreditable to the country. He asked the right hon. Gentleman to consider whether he quite knew where his surroundings were taking him. Up to the present the Government had staved off the rapacious demands of the trade; and now they might be said to be at the mercy of the trade and under the influence of drink. It was a humiliating and degrading position for a Government to be in, and it was disastrous for the country to be at the mercy of a Government so upheld in that House. The Government knew that the country was against them on this Bill. The by-elections, Petitions to that House, the representations of both Houses of Convocation, the feeling of the benches of magistrates of this country, the resolutions of the justices of the city of Manchester, of which the Prime Minister was a most distinguished representative in this House, the representatations of the justices of Liverpool and other great cities showed that the country was against this Bill and the Government had not the political courage to face the country.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N,) said he had not supported this Bill or voted for it at any of its previous stages because there were certain things in it of which he did not approve; on the other hand, he did not vote against it because there were many things in the Bill of which he did approve. But, speaking from an experience of Parliamentary life of many years, he could say that this was the only Bill that had ever been introduced, which, with all its defects, had a prospect of reducing the number of public-houses. They were engaged at the present moment in a great Parliamentary battle with those with whom they were not in sympathy; a battle in which he had taken part in former times and one in which if he lived, and his constituents had the good sense to still send him to this House, he should continue to take part in the future. It was well known that there were two ways of attacking a Government; first, they might attack the Bill on its principles, but the other and perhaps more effective way was to attempt to choke the Government with Amendments to the Bill. That was what the Opposition were at present trying to effect, because it must be plain that if the Government did not take any steps in the direction which the right hon. Gentleman suggested to-day this Bill would go on till Christmas, and he doubted whether it would be done with then. As that was an impossibility the Government were determined to pass the Resolution now before the House. The right hon. Member for East Fife had made a very eloquent and interesting speech, in the course of which he had laid down a strange principle for future political action. The right hon. Gentleman had said a Government returned with a mandate had practically no right to go beyond that mandate or to deal with any question of domestic legislation.

Mr. ASQUITH: That is what I did not say.

Colonel SAUNDERSON: That, at any rate, was the impression which the right hon. Gentleman's speech had produced upon his mind. In that House when a great lawyer spoke they were never quite certain what he wanted to say, or what effect he hoped to give to his words, but allowing for all the intricacies of the legal mind he (Colonel Saunderson) had arrived at the fact that this Government was elected for one object; to carry through, if possible, to a successful termination the South African War. That was the mandate that the Government had received. If the speech of the right hon. Member for East Fife meant anything at all, it meant that the Government had no right with only that mandate to embark on any kind of domestic legislation such as that they were now considering. He did not believe that the right hon. Gentleman if he became a member of a future Government would be content to rely upon that principle. He, also, was an insignificant Member of the House of Commons, and he had a mandate given to him nineteen years ago, and at every general election since the same mandate had been given to him and he had acted strictly up to it. That mandate was at all hazards and by all the efforts at his disposal to keep a Unionist Government in and a Separatist Government out, and, although he had admitted that this Bill had not found much favour in his eyes, he asked himself on the present occasion whether he would be justified in helping to turn the Government out and allowing their place to be taken by hon. Gentlemen whose policy was diametrically opposed to all the best interests of the British Empire; a Party who had apparently laid down the principle that their own country was always wrong and that the enemies of their country, whether in South Africa or Ireland——

***Mr. SPEAKER**: Order, order! There are some considerations which may operate on the hon. and gallant Member's mind which are not relevant to the Motion.

Colonel SAUNDERSON said, believing as firmly as he did what he had stated to the House, he had asked himself whether he should be justified, holding these views, in assisting the Party opposite, whether from Ireland or England, to turn out the Government, and he had come to the conclusion, although he did not like the Bill, that even if it were infinitely worse than hon. Gentlemen opposite made it out to be he should still be right in voting for the Government.

***Sir HENRY FOWLER** (Wolverhampton, E.) said the hon. and gallant Gentleman who had just sat down had not dealt with either the Motion of the right hon. Member for East Fife or with the original proposal. He was prepared to give a vote rather against his own principles in order that he might maintain a Unionist Government in power. The hon. and gallant Member had stated his opinion that the liberties, privileges, and rights of the House of Commons were of trivial importance in comparison with the supreme issue of maintaining right hon. Gentlemen opposite in power. He thought that speech and what had transpired during the last three or four hours singularly illustrated the indifference and almost contempt of the House of Commons which was at the bottom of this Motion. The arguments of his right hon. friend the Member for East Fife, of the right hon. Member for East Somerset, and of the hon. Member for Oldham, and the powerful and eloquent speech of the Member for Spen Valley, had not been considered worthy of a reply by Members on the Treasury Bench and their supporters. They seemed to be absolutely indifferent. They could not answer the arguments put forward showing why this Resolution should not be passed—the disgrace involved and the effect on the Bill itself—and they maintained this policy of silence which was but another phase of the registration of those ukases to which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University had referred. Let the House recall the position at the close of the speech of the Prime Minister. The great part of that speech was the laying down of what the right hon. Gentleman considered to be a necessary change in the procedure of this House in order that it might be enabled to discharge its duty. Before the right hon, Gentleman proceeded to apply that principle to the present state of affairs and to the Bill before the House he dealt with the general question of the utilisation of the time at the disposal of the House, He (Sir Henry) did not wish to refer to previous years. He was quite ready to admit that the condition of public business at the present time was absolutely unprecedented and intolerable. But who was responsible for that? Not the Opposition. The Leader of the House was responsible for the conduct of business. Who fixed the meeting of Parliament so late as the 3rd of February? Under the present state of affairs the great demands on the Government, the questions that had been raised affecting the whole policy of the country, and with war going on in different parts of the world—the House of Commons should have been summoned earlier.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Earlier than 3rd February?

***SIR HENRY FOWLER**: Yes. The House met too late, and it had had too long holidays. If this was the most important Bill in the Government's programme then it ought to have been introduced much earlier and got through its crucial stages at an earlier period of the session. But what had occurred? For a month after they met they were engaged in endeavouring to find out what was the Prime Minister's policy, what were the views of His Majesty's Government on the most vital issue that had been raised in this country for a generation. And to this hour they did not know what those views were, and if there was a dissolution immediately they were not in a position, and he did not believe the Government or any person was in a position, to state what were the views the right hon. Gentleman and the Government held on the fiscal question. Of course the Estimates had to be passed before the 31st of March, and he did not complain that this Bill was not brought in until after the 31st of March; but then the Government brought in what was termed an uncontroversial Budget. The right hon. Gentleman was right in bringing in the Budget when he did, but it ought to have been gone on with and got out of the way. The difficulties of Parliamentary business had been aggravated by the various attitudes of the Prime Minister as to the course of business. He interposed the Scotch Education Bill, which was eminently a Bill for a Committee upstairs, and the time of the House was wasted for another week. Then came this Bill. The House went into Committee on 6th June when a whole day was occupied. On 7th June, there was a whole day, on 8th June there was one hour, and then, forsooth, the House went back to the Finance Bill, and it heard nothing more of the Licensing Bill till 27th June. Even the Treasury Bench had then forgotten what had happened, and a good deal of time was spent in trying to remember where we left off. There was a whole day on 27th June, a morning sitting on 28th June, another on 29th June, and in the Evening Sitting an hour and a half, and the total time up to that day spent in Committee was thirty-four hours. It was under these circumstances that the Prime Minister had come down to the House and asked them to close all discussion in this matter and brought forward his Resolution in order—he thanked the right hon. Gentleman for teaching them the phrase—to force this Bill down the throat of the House. Two years ago the right hon. Gentleman recommended the House to guillotine the education debate. But under what circumstances was that done, On that occasion the Bill had been in Committee thirty-eight days, and the right hon. Gentleman said a strange light was thrown upon the Parliamentary situation in which they found themselves by the fact that after being in Committee thirty-eight days they were still a considerable distance from the end of the Bill. But he would recall the right hon. Gentleman's memory to the fact that in that Committee the right hon. Gentleman was in almost constant attendance, that he heard a great many of those Amendments moved and argued on both sides, which had not been his practice in this Bill. Why did not the right hon. Gentleman adopt the same policy here; he quite admitted that there might be some justification for a Motion to bring that debate to a close.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Which way did you vote?

*Sir HENRY FOWLER said he was perfectly sure that he voted against it, because he wished to throw the Bill out. The Licensing Bill, however, this vital measure on which the Government were standing or falling, had only been discussed in Committee for a period of time which, being added up, amounted to thirty-four hours, and he put it to the Prime Minister whether that was a sufficient time for the consideration of such a Bill. The right hon. Gentleman could not say that there had been obstruction on the Bill. He did not know whether the Prime Minister had ever heard of a well-known saying of Lord Beaconsfield, that "The man who leads the House of Commons must live in the House of Commons." He was not one of those who expected the Prime Minister to be here at every hour of the evening and attending to all the debates; but on the vital Bill of the session, which the Prime Minister regarded as of supreme importance, he respectfully submitted to the right hon. Gentleman that it would have facilitated its passage if he had been present to acquaint himself with the well-reasoned and strong objections to this badly-drawn Bill, a Bill which, if it was to be put into shape to be rendered workmanlike, required amendment in almost every line. He did not blame the Government for the drafting of the Bill—he supposed they were advised about that, though whether by their legal or their non-legal friends he could not say—but it was drawn on a wrong principle. The Bill was brought in to meet an admitted general difficulty that magistrates had with reference to diminishing the number of licences on account of their excessive number; and if it had been confined to that instead of being very cleverly drawn so as to include a large number of matters which would very seriously, if not practically, destroy the disciplinary control of the licensing magistrates, outside the simple question of refusing renewals on the ground of excessive number, it would have proceeded upon a better principle. The Prime Minister could not say that the Bill had been fully discussed. This Bill depended greatly upon its details, and these had not been discussed. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to think it would be a calamity if the House were not permitted to rise on 12th August. It would be an even greater calamity to the House to have its proceedings throttled. He did not know whether the Prime Minister realised the danger, alluded to in the admirable speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Somerset, that this Bill could not be a final settlement. The right hon. Gentleman was now introducing a new principle into legislation. Hitherto, when a Bill had been considered—when both sides had brought forward their objections and these had been considered—such legislation had been accepted as a rule. But if Bills were to be passed without discussion then the Prime Minister could not complain if the majority opposed to those Bills refused to accept the decision taken under such circumstances, and felt themselves at liberty to re-open the whole question. The Prime Minister had not forgotten the Bill of his right hon.

friend the Member for West Monmouth. That Bill was fought tenaciously by a combination of some of the ablest men in that House, yet the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouth never once applied the closure. There was not an Amendment of the law which the acutest mind desired which was not discussed and voted upon in the House. What had been the result? That when the very men who had opposed it, notably the late Chancellor of the Exchequer, the right hon. Member for West Bristol, who was one of the leaders of the Opposition to that Bill, found themselves in power the alteration of hardly a syllable was proposed.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I myself introduced six Amendments and the Chancellor of the Exchequer one.

*SIR HENRY FOWLER: Ah, we must not only number the Amendments but weigh them. My hon. friend will not deny the general principle that the Death Duties have now been practically accepted. Then there was another Bill of which, perhaps, I may say a word or two. I sat for thirty-five days on the Treasury Bench carrying through the Local Government Bill; at one time there were 1,400 Amendments to that Bill. I believe there were between 400 and 500 divisions, and the closure was only moved once, and that was by an hon. friend of mine without my knowledge. That is a mode of procedure which is not open to the danger of the present proposals. [AN HON. MEMBER: The Government sat into the next year.] Yes, because the Government were in earnest, because they considered their legislation necessary for the good of the country, and thought that of more importance than even the hunting or other seasons.

SIR GEORGE BARTLEY (Islington N.): Perhaps you had a reasonable Opposition.

*SIR HENRY FOWLER: One of my right hon. friends reminds me that one Amendment lasted seven days. I do not say the Opposition was unreasonable. At the close of that prolonged controversy I said that I had no right to complain or to maintain that there had been any obstructive opposition, that it was a measure in which the interest of the House was very strongly aroused. A Bill could have no moral weight when passed under such circumstances as were now proposed.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: What about the Home Rule Bill?

*SIR HENRY FOWLER: The Home Rule Bill was fully discussed in this House.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: During how many days?

*SIR HENRY FOWLER: It was altogether, I believe, eighty-two days in this House, but that Bill was brought in in direct compliance with a mandate of the country taken at the general election. Mr. Gladstone was returned to power by a small majority, it is true, in 1892, but he was returned to pass Home Rule. At all events, it was not sprung upon the country. Mr. Gladstone, when he went to the country, did not ask for the support of Conservatives on some other specific ground, which they considered of great importance, and then consider that a mandate for Home Rule. In 1900 the Government got Liberal votes, and men are sitting on the opposite side of the House by Liberal votes given solely and purposely for one reason—namely, the patriotic support of the Government in a time of war, but now the votes obtained on that issue from Liberals are given to defeat what the electors considered their most cherished political convictions. I will sum up in one sentence of the Prime Minister's. I will add nothing to it nor take anything from it. What the right hon. Gentleman said in reference to a similar Resolution was that "he resisted it because it would be the wreck of the liberties of Parliament——"

*MR. A. J. BALFOUR: When was this?

SIR **HENRY FOWLER**: It was in 1894—"and for all time would impair the efficiency and cloud the honour of this Assembly." It is for that reason I shall vote against the Motion.

*MR. T. W. **RUSSELL** (Tyrone, S.) said that this was the fourth occasion on which he had taken part in a debate on a Motion of that nature. The first was in connection with the Crimes Act, the second the Home Rule Bill, and the third the Evicted Tenants Bill. The difference between these cases and the present Motion was enormous. The Prime Minister had said, and said truly, that each case had to be considered on its merits, but he did not tell them what was to be done when a case had no merits. With regard to the Closure Motion on the Crimes Act and the Evicted Tenants Bill, everyone who knew anything about the state of Ireland in those days knew that the social condition was such as to necessitate prompt procedure, while as to the Home Rule Bill that was an Imperial issue which had been discussed at very great length, and was bound to be settled at some time. But the present case showed no resemblance to either of those three. The Prime Minister had not proposed this Motion on the ground that there had been obstruction, but he would not say that there had not been; evidently he had no settled convictions upon that point. He had not yet made up his mind. But he would tell the right hon. Gentleman that there had been cool and deliberate obstruction upon this Bill. What did he mean by that? Of course the Prime Minister was not expected, with his multifarious duties, to attend that House at nine o'clock, and as a matter of fact he had not seen what had been going on under his new Rules. But what had happened when the Bill had been in Committee was that the Government at nine o'clock had been in a minority, dreading the attendance of the Irish Members, and so they had had speeches from the hon. Member for the Brightside Division of Sheffield.

MR. J. F. **HOPE** (Sheffield, Brightside): Never on this Bill. [OPPOSITION cries of "Yes."]

*MR. T. W. **RUSSELL**: Then we have had speeches from the hon. and learned Member for Finsbury, and the hon. Member for Newcastle, who were not artists in the business at all. [Some cries of "Peckham."] He reserved Peckham, because his hon. friend the Member for Peckham was an artist, and did not lend himself to obstruction. What he would point out to the Prime Minister was that there had not been one word that could be construed as obstruction, save and except the deliberate obstruction arranged by the Government to prevent them from being in a minority. It was monstrous that the result of their having to listen to these Parliamentary banalities should be that their Parliamentary liberties were to be docked, curtailed, and restrained, and because hon. Members would not come from their clubs and dinner parties to discuss the business of the nation. He did not care who was the author of the Rules of Procedure, they ought to be abolished forthwith. No obstruction! Then why did not the right hon. Gentleman take this Bill during Ascot week? Let the country understand that the Prime Minister deliberately set this Bill aside during Ascot week in order that his supporters should enjoy their fun. He had another reason to advance agains this Motion. The Bill had only been discussed for thirty-four hours. The Education Bill was discussed for thirty-eight days, the Home Rule Bill eighty-two days, and the Evicted Tenants Bill three days. Compare that with the thirty-four hours devoted to this Bill and let them look also at the nature of the debate. Off-licences were debated several hours and were ruled out of the Bill; the whole scheme of new licences had been altered, and the proposal to give compensation to licences granted after the passing of the Bill had been rejected. Again, hours had been spent over the question of the duty of publicans to supply other than intoxicating drinks, and the Government had had to give way on that. If in thirty-four hours it had been possible to secure such important concessions, how could it be suggested that there had been obstruction? He regretted that the right hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh was not in his place. He had taken up a very extraordinary position. He had said: "I dislike the Bill. I have not voted for it and do not intend to, but I shall support this Motion because there is a chance the Government will go out if it is not passed." The right hon. Gentleman need not be alarmed that the Government would go out. They were not thinking of going out, and would not go out if the Motion were rejected. The right hon. Gentleman disliked the Bill and the Motion. But he had a still greater horror of a Separatist Government. Who, however, were the real Separatists? The Prime Minister said the House must either be reduced to impotence or it must cease to be a deliberative Assembly. Did the right hon. Gentleman think the people of England would allow their Parliament to be reduced to impotence or consent to it ceasing to be a deliberative assembly? The people of England were not to be humbugged in that way. By a statement of that kind the Prime Minister could only mean devolution of the work of the House. They might call Home Rule by any name they liked, but they would find that the thing was the same. Who had asked for this Bill? It had not been demanded by a single public meeting; every one of the Labour Members had voted against it [AN HON. MEMBER: And will do so again]; Bishops and Nonconformist ministers alike were unanimously opposed to it. It had been introduced and was to be forced through because of the dominance of an imperious trade, and his authority for saying that was the language of the deputation which recently waited on the Prime Minister in one of the rooms of that House. They did not ask for compensation, they only asked that the discretion of the magistrates should be stopped, and they said that unless that was done something would happen to the Tory Party at the next general election. That was the origin of the Bill. It was a mere election dodge, and if it was possible to indict a Government as it was possible to indict an individual Member for a corrupt practice there was not a judge in the land that would not unseat the whole Ministry.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich) said that unfortunately he had already been twice closured since he had become a Member of this House, and if this Motion were carried it was very probable that a Motion he had down, with a view of securing that the compensation should go to the licence-holders rather than to the brewers, would also be closured. Labour Members naturally felt rather keenly about this proposed restriction of their rights of free speech. They had not the House of Lords behind them; no Labour representative had ever yet been made a Peer, and he did not think it was likely such an event would ever occur. It was as the last speaker had said—wherever the people of the country had had an opportunity of doing so they had expressed their disgust with the Bill. He wondered that they had not had Petitions sent in in favour of the Bill yards upon yards long, but with the signatures a foot apart, so as to secure length and weight of paper. Possibly the explanation was that the licence-holders were not so strongly in favour of the Bill, because they realised that the compensation under it would not reach them, but would go to men who already had more than their proper share. He listened to the speech of the Prime Minister that morning with very great attention. One had always been led to believe that the right hon. Gentleman had a genuine desire to meet the wishes of the nation in regard to domestic social legislation. But quite recently a Bill was brought forward at the request of 3,000,000 of organised workers, and the House was good enough to pass its Second Reading by a majority of thirty-eight votes. Now the Government had discovered it had no time to devote to the further stages of the measure. Why were the claims of these workers pushed on one side in favour of the demands of a small body?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! I understand the hon. Member is referring to a non-Government Bill which has passed a Second Reading on a Friday. That is not relevant to this Motion.

MR. CROOKS said he feared he was a somewhat troublesome child, for he had not yet got into the ways of the House. What he was trying to arrive at was what justification there was for obeying the dictates of 110,000 licence-holders while there were so many measures for the wellbeing of the whole community urgently called for. There were thousands of men idle, thousands of children hungry, and thousands of the poor inadequately housed. He would like to see this Licensing Bill improved in the interests of morality and temperance. He was on one occasion rebuked by an hon. Member for saying that it seemed to him that politics in that House was a game, but how could he help saying that when he sat there hour after hour and day after day and saw the time of Parliament wasted as it was, when it might be devoted to carrying measures for the benefit of the poor instead of for the endowment of the rich.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY (Shropshire, Newport) said there was not a Member of the House who did not regret the necessity for the step that was now being taken, but it had to be recognised that it was a necessity. He was quite prepared to acknowledge the feeling which such a proposal naturally excited amongst the Opposition, and he thought that on the whole the spokesmen of the Party opposite were to be congratulated on the moderation with which they had stated their case. Possibly one or two Members had somewhat overstepped the mark; for instance, he thought the hon. Member for the Spen Valley Division, when he came to read his speech, would probably regret that it had not contained a little more charity, tolerance, and forbearance. But the main point the House had to consider was whether or not there had been adequate time for the discussion of the matters already dealt with, and whether or not, under the proposal of the Prime Minister, sufficient time would be allowed for the remainder of the Bill. Personally he believed there had been adequate time for the consideration of the main controversial portions of the Bill already dealt with, and that sufficient time was being allowed for the proper discussion of the principal controversial portions that remained. There were one or two points connected with the present position of the Bill which ought to be borne in mind. It was common knowledge that hon. Members on the Opposition side had over and over again avowed in the lobbies that the Government should have no legislation this year, unless they secured it at the point of the bayonet. [OPPOSITION cries of "No."] The statement had been made to him personally.

[Cries of "Name."] That being so, it was impossible for the Government to carry any legislation, unless by the drastic means of compulsion. It was also germane to consider not only what had been done, but what yet remained to be done. Only three lines of Clause 1 of the Bill had been disposed of in Committee; there remained nineteen more lines of Clause 1, and to these lines as many as 270 Amendments stood on the Paper. Surely that must mean to all fair-minded men that it was intended absolutely to strangle the Bill with Amendments. It was a significant fact that of those 270 Amendments only two stood in the name of hon. or right hon. Gentlemen on the Front Opposition Bench. He thought that afforded clear evidence of what the Government had to meet if they attempted to fight on ordinary lines.

SIR HENRY FOWLER pointed out that there were 176 Amendments down in the names of Unionist Members alone.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY said that that was on the whole Bill, whereas he was now referring only to the remaining nineteen lines of Clause 1. By the attitude they had adopted the Opposition had made it impossible to carry the Bill, except by some such method as was now proposed. Hon. Members made a mistake when they supposed that the chief function of the House of Commons was that of a deliberative and debating Assembly. The country desired that they should deliberate and debate, but it also desired that they should act, and it was in order to turn the House from a deliberative and debating body into an executive Assembly that the Prime Minister was taking a course which the majority of the House believed to be right and proper, and of which he thought the country at large would approve. He should support the Prime Minister, believing that, in the face of a concerted conspiracy to destroy the Bill, the right hon. Gentleman was acting in the best interests of Parliament and of the country.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) said he agreed with the hon. Member for South Tyrone that the Government would remain in office so long as they could do so by hook, crook, evasion, or anything else. Their organ in the Press was the *Daily Mail*. He thought he was justified in calling it their organ, because so proud were they of its defence of everything they did that they had made its proprietor a baronet. The other day there was an article in that paper which declared that, no matter what happened in the House of Commons, the Government must not go out of office; if they did, the country would be ruined, for their places would be taken by the Pro-Lamas of the Opposition. That was precisely as good a reason for the continued existence of the Government as any that had been given in the debate. As to the Bill, all he would say was that a more scandalous, iniquitous, and corrupt measure no bad, wretched Government had ever tried to force on the House of Commons or on any other legislative Assembly in the world. He appealed to hon. Members not to inflict upon the House any more cant. The Bill had been spoken of as a temperance measure. Did hon. Members suppose that vendors of liquor would support the Bill if it were a temperance measure? They were not such fools. They wanted to sell their wares; the more they sold the more profit they made; they would not be anxious for the passage of this Bill if they thought it likely to result in their selling a drop of liquor less than they now disposed of. Lord Rosebery had alluded to the Government as a Government of "hanky-panky." On consulting a technical dictionary he found that "hanky-panky" was taken from a Romany word called hickory-pokee, which meant a substitution by sleight-of-hand of a bundle containing stones or lead for another containing money or valuables. It further appeared that the person who habitually practised hickory-pokee was known in gipsy circles as a "hanky-panky bloke." It was, therefore, strong language that Lord Rosebery had used. But had he spoken after this Resolution proposed by the Prime Minister his language would have been stronger still. His own language would be much stronger only he could not find Parliamentary terms in which to express his opinion of the Prime Minister and his Government. After the experience of the present session he had thought that nothing the right hon. Gentleman did in the way of evading or crushing out discussion would surprise him, but he had to confess he had been mistaken. The Government now had the effrontery to throw the blame on the Opposition for the delay of a Bill which their own supporters had obstructed. Time after time they had put up men to obstruct their own Bill until by bullying or teasing they could get a sufficient number of their supporters back from dinner to give them a majority. Good reasons had been given why there should be a lengthened discussion of the Bill, and he was quite prepared to state what he intended to do under the circumstances. He represented a self-respecting constituency, and that self-respecting constituency would disapprove of their representative discussing and voting in fetters, and while this proposal was before Parliament for forcing upon it a bribing Bill he would not give a single vote in the House.

Mr. JOHN MORLEY (Montrose Burghs) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion made, and Question, "That the debate be now adjourned"—(*Mr. John Morley.*)—put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed upon Monday next.

DEAN FOREST (RE-COMMITTED) BILL.

Considered in Committee, and reported, without Amendment. Read the third time, and passed.

POST OFFICE SITES BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Motion made, and Question, "That the debate be now adjourned"—(*Lord Stanley.*)—put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed upon Monday next.

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*)—put, and agreed to.

Adjourned accordingly at twenty-seven minutes after Five o'clock, till Monday next.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 4th July, 1904.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill shave been complied with :—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3); Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 4); Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Provisional Order.

Also the Certificates that no Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bills :—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1); Education Board Provisional Order (Cardiff); Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2).

And also the Certificate that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have not been compliedwith :—Saddleworth and Springhead Tramways.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

Charing Cross, Euston, and Hampstead Railway Bill. The King's consent signified; and Bill reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Matlock and District Gas Bill [H.L.]. Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Ilford Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]. Read 3^{a}; Amendments made; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons

London County Council (Money) Bill. Read 3^{a}, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Dean Forest Bill; Rotherham Corporation Bill. Brought from the Commons; read 1^{a}; and referred to the Examiners.

Ticehurst and District Water and Gas Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

London and North-Western Railway Bill. Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill; London and India Docks Company Bill; Swindon Corporation Bill; Middlesbrough, Stockton-on-Tees, and Thornaby Tramways Bill; Carlisle Corporation Bill; Clyde Navigation (Works) Bill. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Braye be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Earl of Mayo; read, and agreed to.

Buxton Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]. The King's consent signified; and Bill reported, with Amendments.

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [H.L.]—(Walton-on-Thames Order). Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [H.L.]—(Kingswood Order opposed). Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, no parties having appeared in opposition to the said Order; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The orders made on the 17th and 21st of June discharged, and Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill [H.L.]. House in Committee (according to order). The Amendments proposed by the Select Committee made; further Amendments made. Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]. House in Committee (according to order). The Amendments proposed by the Select Committee made; a further Amendment made; Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow.

PETITIONS.

SUPPLY OF ELECTRICITY BILL [H.L.].

Petitions to be heard by Counsel against; of Corporation of Tynemouth; Corporation of Islington; and Metropolitan Electric Supply Company. Read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

CAPE OF GOOD HOPE (OBSERVATORY).

Report of His Majesty's Astronomer at the Cape of Good Hope to the Secretary of the Admiralty, for the year 1903.

TRADE REPORT (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3201. France (Nice).

TRANSVAAL AND ORANGE RIVER COLONY.

Correspondence relating to affairs in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony.

SOUTH AFRICA.

Census returns of British South Africa.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP.

Annual Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories and Workshops for the year 1903. Part I. Reports.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Return showing the population, valuation, the average assessment levied under the Education (Scotland) Act, 1872, for the three years 1900–1901 to 1902–1903 in each parish, and the total raised from each local government district, together with calculations showing the amount which would be raised from each parish if the total assessment so raised from each local government district were imposed as a district rate upon parishes on the basis of (1) Valuation alone; and (2) Half on valuation and half on population.

LABOUR STATISTICS (ST. LOUIS EXHIBITION).

Charts (reduced in size) illustrating the statistics of trade, employment, and conditions of labour in the United Kingdom, prepared for St. Louis Exhibition by the Commercial, Labour, and Statistical Department of the Board of Trade.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND).

Rules made by the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland (1) determining the number of centre superintendents to be appointed for the examinations for 1904; (2) appointing the places at which the examinations for 1904 shall be held.

PUBLIC WORKS LOAN BOARD.

Twenty-ninth Annual Report of the Public Works Loan Board, 1903–1904; with appendices.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

STANDING COMMITTEE.

Report from the Committee of Selection for the Standing Committee, That they have added the Viscount Sidmouth to the Standing Committee; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

LEITH CORPORATION TRAMWAYS ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL.

Message from the Commons that they have ordered that the Committee appointed by them to join with the Committee of this House to consider the said Bill do meet the Lords Committee in Committee Room B. on Tuesday next, at Twelve o'clock, as proposed by their Lordships.

THE LOVAT SCOUTS.

THE EARL OF WEMYSS: My Lords, I wish to give notice that I am obliged to put off the Notice standing in my name, "To call attention to the armament and position of the Yeomanry in relation to the Regular cavalry, and to ask who is responsible for the Lovat Scouts having been kept together as a fighting unit in South Africa." I do so as Lord Lovat is in Scotland with his regiment and cannot be in London till the end of the week. As the first free day is this day fortnight, I will put the Notice down for that day.

EDUCATION (TRANSFERRED SCHOOLS) BILL [H.L.].

[Second Reading.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

The LORD BISHOP of ST. ASAPH: My Lords, in moving the Second Reading of this Bill, I venture once again to emphasise the two main principles of the measure. In natural sequence to the principle of the Act of 1902, this Bill proposes to give to the local education authorities created by that Act that fuller and freer power of negotiation which local experience has already shown to be necessary. The solution of the religious difficulty, the main difficulty really in this controversy, is found in claiming for the parent the right to decide the character of the religious instruction imparted to his child. The critics of this Bill have not, I believe, ventured to question the soundness of either of those two principles. But it is when we come to the application of these principles that difficulties arise. Before discussing these, a brief survey of the situation created by the Act of 1902 is necessary for my purpose.

The Act of 1902 has beyond all question weakened the denominational character of the voluntary schools. The managers of those schools are beginning to realise that their powers of management are severely circumscribed, and that those powers, where the local authority is unfriendly, can be legally reduced to almost humiliating dimensions. But while the powers of management have well nigh gone, the financial responsibilities of the foundation managers have been, at any rate in one respect, very seriously increased. How, for example, are the voluntary schools, in districts which now for the first time know the feeling of a school rate, going by voluntary effort to raise the money necessary for large and reasonable requirements in the way of structural improvements? No doubt in the past the dread of a school board rate has occasionally added some names to subscription lists, but that will occur no longer. In large towns the position of the voluntary schools is in peril of being lowered by the establishment of higher standard schools which the local education authorities, invested by the Act with the power of grading schools, will probably consider necessary for educational efficiency.

In Wales there is an added trouble. The Act of 1902 euphemistically describes the voluntary schools as non-provided; and in the Principality that description has been interpreted to mean that the voluntary schools are to be non-provided with the means of maintenance. It is true that the Act of 1902 has left to the voluntary schools a remnant of their old privileges. Unfortunately this remnant now supplies our opponents with their one grievance; I say their one grievance because when complete popular control is once given the rest that is asked for follows. In approaching this delicate question of popular control I do not think that any fair-minded man will question the greatness of the services rendered to popular education in this country by the Church of England in the past. The Church of England did not wait to educate the working man until he was enfranchised. The Church long years ago entered upon this work inspired by the parental duty "educate your children." The State has recently been moved to undertake this task by the political motive, "educate your masters." But, my Lords, great as are the claims of the voluntary schools, I frankly admit that when I find that before 1870 public funds contributed only 37 per cent. of the total cost of maintenance, and that now they will contribute more than 90 per cent., justice demands that control should go to the paymaster.

In the present controversy the representatives of the voluntary schools are, of course, the champions of the cause of religious education, and their opponents the champions of popular control. These claims do not seem to me to be irreconcilable. Even in Wales the local education authorities are not as a body opposed to the giving of religious instruction. This Bill offers an arrangement by which the representatives of the voluntary schools may barter the small remnant of privilege still left them for a plan which will secure religious instruction in all the elementary schools of the country. This Bill would make such an arrangement locally easy and legally binding. It seems to me—if this may be said here without disrespect—that such an arrangement is more easily carried out in detail by negotiations with the local authorities than by an appeal to Parliament, where other considerations would come in to harness and mutilate the progress of any such measure. In any arrangement contemplated there are two points that must, of course, be fully and fairly faced—the question of inside facilities and the abolition of tests. I think it will be generally admitted that the vast majority of the people of this country have made it clear that they consider that religious instruction is an essential part of education, and that they are resolved that the education given in their elementary schools shall not be bereft of this essential. The difficulty is the character of the religious instruction to be imparted. The Board schools met the difficulty in a somewhat negative fashion: "You must take the syllabus we offer or nothing." In passing may I observe that there must be some flaw in the logic of those who desire to free religion from all State patronage and control and at the same time now ask the State to endow and control this school board religion in all the elementary schools of the country. This attempt to formulate a religious instruction so vague and varied that it must be nameless, is not satisfactory.

May we not get clean away from the wrangle about denominational and undenominational, if we substitute for these gaunt and irritating epithets the word "parental"? Will anyone venture to maintain that any body of school managers—Board or voluntary—ought to have the right or the power to decide the faith which is taught to the child? This Bill thus claims what common sense and common justice demand—the right of the parent to have his child taught his own faith in no delusive or proselytising spirit. The recognition of this parental right places us on sound ground. If religious instruction is to form an essential part of education in elementary schools it must be given in their school hours. Your Lordships may have heard of an experiment on a large scale made last year at Eastbourne by the Free Church Council to organise what are called outside facilities. The complete failure of that experiment remains for our instruction. On the other hand the plan of inside facilities existing in the Drury Lane Day Industrial School, which is practically an ordinary Board school, affords evidence that such a system may be successfully worked while people are reasonable and just. No doubt there is, as the noble Earl opposite said, opposition in some quarters to inside facilities; but it is my conviction that the opposition grows weaker as the justice of the demand and the principle upon which it rests are more clearly understood.

Our opponents are not unwilling that the school board religion should be taught at the public expense. We, however, only ask that we may be allowed to teach our own children at our own cost their own faith. I desire before leaving this point to quote a solution of the religious difficulty which was put forth some time ago in the form of an Education Bill. That Bill made these proposals: "All children will be bound to attend the religious instruction. Every denomination will be able to obtain the religious instruction they desire for their children. Such instruction will be imparted by the ministers themselves or by such other persons as may be appointed by them. The Government shall not be called upon to pay for the religious instruction so given." These provisions are taken from an Education Bill drafted by the late Mr. Thomas Gee, a minister and leader of Welsh Nonconformity, a man of unique influence among Nonconformists. Mr. Gee as a politician did not belong to the less advanced section of his Party, and I cannot bring myself to believe that an arrangement which commended itself to Mr. Gee will be repudiated by the political representatives of Nonconformity to-day. It would be premature at this stage to discuss in further detail more than the main principle of this proposal.

I now come to the question of tests. Once more justice seems to me, I frankly admit it, to deprecate the imposition of a religious test for the great majority of those who are now public servants. But I go even further. I am not at all sure that a legal religious test is the best means of securing what we want. The character of the teacher is the important point. I grant that the Bible teacher, to do any good, must be a Bible believer.

How is this to be secured? You must have, it is said, a test. There is a legal test and a real test, and often they are not identical. There may be a legal test laxly applied, and laxly submitted to, and therefore, for the purposes for which it was devised, in no sense a real test. I imagine that the most strenuous defender of legal tests to-day would have to admit abundant illustrations of this statement in the past. On the other hand, you may have a very real test without any legal sanction at all for the same. In Wales, we have had for ten years undenominational intermediate schools, without any religious test whatever for the teachers of the staff.

At the beginning of things, in some of the schools with which I was well acquainted, the governing bodies were overwhelmingly Nonconformist, and, although no test was supposed to be applied and the suggestion of a test would have been indignantly repudiated, I know, on the best authority, that no Churchman, and most certainly no Roman Catholic, would have had the slightest chance of being appointed to the mastership, although his qualifications were unquestionably the highest. It went even further than this. Where the Calvinistic Methodists are predominant other Nonconformists grievously complained that the silent test which all clearly understood, but none acknowledged, was Calvinistic. But I now gladly recognise that this initial tendency to unfairness is disappearing. But this experience shows that you may have very real tests which are not legal, and legal tests which are not real. The fact is that, in the ultimate resort, these matters are ruled by the predominant feeling and conviction of those interested in the school, and that, while theoretically it seems unanswerable that for Christian teaching there should be a legal test that the teacher is a Christian, it will be found in practice that the main safeguard lies in the religious convictions of the community immediately concerned. Even in Wales I could accept that security provided that the power of the local authorities is not restricted by such Parliamentary fetters as the Cowper-Temple Clause.

Experience has made clear that the Nonconformists as a body are in favour of religious instruction. When I see the forces that are gathering for those who value education only on its secular and material side, I feel profoundly anxious that the friends of religious instruction, whether Churchmen or Nonconformists, should not weaken their influence by unnecessary strife and division. Remove the grievances that cause contention, and the united forces of those in favour of religious education may be trusted to secure qualified teachers, because absence of legal tests by no means implies absence of inquiry as to a teacher's faith and fitness to instruct. Looking at this matter as a Churchman, I ask myself whether the cause of religious education, for which the Church has made such splendid sacrifices in the past, will not best be promoted by such an arrangement as would be permitted under the provisions of this Bill.

It seems to me that the best use which can be made of the hold over schools which the Act has left to the Church, may be, before it is lost piecemeal, to exchange it, on adequate security, for an arrangement which would give religious instruction in all our elementary schools. Your Lordships may have read Mr. Augustine Birrell's words on this point—

> "How," he asks, "can a compromise be affected? *Do ut des* calls our Birmingham Bismarck. It is a wise maxim. What has Nonconformity got to offer the Church of England? But one thing—the Cowper-Temple Clause. What ought or might the Church party be willing to give in exchange for a right of entry into the provided schools?"

Mr. Birrell's answer to his own question indicates his approval of such a mutual concession.

I would venture to say one word to my Nonconformist friends. I am anxious to understand and to sympathise with their grievances; such sympathy is not rendered easier by the grotesque misrepresentations which have prevailed of the Act of 1902. I think it may be said that the Church of England has borne all this misrepresentation with dignity and self-control. There are extremists who hope that a swinging pendulum may give them all they ask for, but I believe they will find that they have miscalculated their own power. Be this as it may, I trust that the cause of education is not to be made once more a subject of political strife and agitation. It is my conviction that the measure now submitted to your Lordships would do something to arrest such a catastrophe. The details of the measure are doubtless open to amendment, but the principles upon which it is based are, I believe, accepted as sound. The local education authorities will have a freer hand given to them in carrying out those educational responsibilities with which they are already charged. It is, I believe, the verdict of the people of this country that there is to be religious education in our elementary schools, and this Bill claims that the faith taught to the child shall be decided by the parent of the child.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2a."—(*The Lord Bishop of St. Asaph.*)

THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL AND PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (The Marquess of LONDONDERRY): My Lords, I did not rise at once to address your Lordships when the right rev. Prelate resumed his seat, as I anticipated that I should have heard other right rev. Prelates discuss the question, and I certainly had hoped to have heard from noble Lords opposite their views either in approval or condemnation of the Bill. I confess that my position at the present moment is a somewhat difficult one. It might be said that there was no reason whatever why His Majesty's Government should interfere in regard to a measure, which, if my memory serves me rightly, the right rev. Prelate who introduced it declared on the First Reading was one for which he and he alone was responsible; that it would have been possible for your Lordships to decide this question without any intervention whatever from the Government Bench; but there are various reasons which force me, if I may use that expression, to interpose in this discussion.

On the occasion of the First Reading of the Bill I responded for His Majesty's Government, and I then expressed the sympathy that I personally felt with the right rev. Prelate in the course he had taken; but I also said that if a definite answer was to be given by His Majesty's Government as to their attitude upon this measure, we must have sufficient time for the consideration of it, seeing that it is undoubtedly a measure which makes considerable alterations in the Act of 1902, for which the noble Duke the late Lord President of the Council (the Duke of Devonshire) and myself were responsible. As I then explained, we could not at a moment's notice allow alterations to take place in that measure, no matter how satisfactory they might be, and even if they were accepted by the whole community, without giving careful consideration to them ourselves. Naturally the right rev. Prelate, after the remarks I made on that occasion, has a perfect right to expect from me a full reply on behalf of His Majesty's Government to-day. I trust that he will not consider me guilty of any discourtesy, or of breaking any pledge that I made on the occasion of the First Reading, when I say that, for reasons which I shall enumerate, it is impossible for me, on behalf of His Majesty's Government, to give any definite answer to-day as to whether His Majesty's Government approve or disapprove of this measure.

As your Lordships may remember, I welcomed the speech of the right rev. Prelate when he moved the First Reading of the Bill, for the right rev. Prelate had accepted the suggestion I had myself made at Carnarvon. I expressed a hope, when speaking at Carnarvon, that it might be possible for all classes of the community in Wales to meet together and arrive at some solution of the difficult problem in that part of the country, and I added that if an amicable solution was arrived at, His Majesty's Government would regard it as very satisfactory and would, if possible, do all in their power to further it. After the discussion which took place in your Lordships' House on the First Reading of this Bill, I had hoped that this question would be discussed and ventilated, not only in your Lordships' House, but throughout the country, so that before the time came for me to speak on the Second Reading of the Bill, I should have been able to gather what was the feeling in that part of the country at which the Bill is aimed, and to give your Lordships some definite answer as to the position of the Government. But I am obliged to admit that the hopes I expressed at that time were of too sanguine a character.

I do not know that I can call to mind a single speech in or out of Parliament, either giving a general acceptance to the scheme of the right rev. Prelate, or even a welcome, no matter how cold. There may be reasons why this should be the case. On the occasion of the First Reading of this Bill, the noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition in this House (whose absence I am sure we all regret, and the reason for it still more) in the very brief speech which he then delivered, offered opposition of the most hostile character to one of the main provisions of the Bill. It may have been due to that cause; but as to that I offer no opinion. But I do certainly recognise this fact, that the Bill does not at the present moment fulfil the condition which I considered so absolutely essential for its recognition as a measure of conciliation, namely, that it should be accepted by all parties in the nature of what I might call an eirenicon. As the Bill has not been accepted in the spirit in which I had ventured to hope it would have been before it reached its present stage, it is, of course, impossible for His Majesty's Government to give support to the measure. That being the case, I cannot but think that any discussion which may take place in your Lordships' House to-day must be more or less of an academic character. Unless noble Lords opposite have changed their minds, as I sincerely hope they have, since we last discussed this matter, they will, in all probability, offer opposition to the Second Reading, and, as I have said, the only chance of its becoming law would lie in its being accepted in the country, and receiving the universal consent of your Lordships' House.

The main and essential provision of the right rev. Prelate's Bill is to permit what I will call an arrangement, and what in vulgar terms might be called a system of bargaining, between voluntary school managers and the local education authority. But your Lordships know full well that if a proper bargain is to be made between two parties, both must start on fairly, if not absolutely, equal terms. The experience of the last few months has shown that, in certain parts of the country, the voluntary schools would not start on equal terms with the local authorities, inasmuch as they have been, I venture to think, extremely unfairly treated, and undue pressure has been put upon them. That being the case, until Parliament passes what is known as the Defaulting Authorities Bill, which I anticipate will shortly come up from the House of Commons, and which I venture to hope will become law before this session is brought to an end, the voluntary school managers will not be on a par with the local authorities, and will not be able to argue or bargain on equal terms. In these circumstances, if the right rev. Prelate will allow me to say so, I do think that the discussion on the Second Reading of this Bill must be even more academic, inasmuch as we cannot offer any suggestion as to what could or should be done until the Bill to which I have referred becomes the law of the land. Therefore, any remarks which I may make now must have reference to conditions which will arise after the passage of that measure.

In the Bill now before your Lordships there are many points of great difficulty; but to my mind the essential element in this Bill in regard to the question of bargaining between the managers and the local education authorities is that of reciprocity. I want to make very clear what to my mind is the definition of reciprocity. It is obvious that no solution of the difficulty can be considered a fair one which denies to parents the right to have their children given such religious instruction as they desire, merely because the school near which they live has been provided out of the rates. Very few of your Lordships will have failed to observe the remarks made in the other House by Mr. Lloyd-George and Dr. Macnamara, who have given vent to volumes of praise of the Scottish system of education, and who have also gone further, and declared their desire that the Scottish system should be extended to England and Wales. If that desire were carried into effect, the restrictions which at the present moment prevent denominational education in provided schools would entirely disappear. I regret that the noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition is not in his place to-day, because I should have liked to ask him how he reconciles the statements of his followers in the other

House with his own remarks on the First Reading of this Bill, when he denounced any question of denominational education in voluntary schools. Compare the proposals of Dr. Macnamara and Mr. Lloyd-George with the proposal contained in the Bill of the right rev. Prelate. The right. rev. Prelate's Bill only requires that denominational instruction should be given in voluntary or provided schools at the expense of the denomination, whereas under the Scottish system denominational instruction is given in schools where it is demanded, not at the expense of the denomination, but at the expense of the rates as a whole.

LORD TWEEDMOUTH: I am sorry to interrupt the noble Marquess, but I should be glad if he could quote the speech of Mr. Lloyd-George in which he said that he was ready to accept the Scottish system in all its details in Wales.

THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY: I think I can quote that from the speech of Dr. Macnamara.

LORD TWEEDMOUTH: Can the noble Marquess quote it from the speech of Mr. Lloyd-George?

THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY: I have not Mr. Lloyd-George's speech with me, but I have it in my mind. I may say that I quoted his speech in his own constituency, and was not contradicted there; but as I have not the extract I will leave Mr. Lloyd-George out of consideration. I do not think the noble Lord will repudiate the fact that that statement has been made by Dr. Macnamara. What I do say is that if this Bill is denounced by noble Lords opposite, or not considered worthy of consideration in this House because it does offer these proposals, then I say there is altogether taken out of the Bill that spirit of reciprocity which in any bargain must be an essential feature. I now come to a very difficult part of the question. I refer to what are known as the facilities given for denominational instruction in provided schools. I am one of those who consider religious instruction in schools as of such importance that I view with the greatest possible apprehension any proposal to give it up. It is said that a syllabus could be issued which would be agreeable to all parties, but I doubt very much whether that is the case. I go further. It is my conviction that a teacher who has to impart religious instruction should be a person absolutely devoted to it in spirit, and who honestly and earnestly believes in the instruction which he or she imparts. Consequently, I think that that is one of the parts of the Bill which, even if it were accepted by your Lordships, we should have to very carefully consider before allowing it to become law.

I hope the right rev. Prelate will not think that in the remarks I am making I am guilty of undue criticism. I can assure him I fully recognise his good intentions in introducing this measure. I should very much regret that he should for one moment think that I did not appreciate the great efforts he has made to solve this very difficult question, which some people regard as impossible of solution. But it has been my duty to-day to endeavour to balance the difficulties and the advantages that may arise, should the Bill become law. I say at once that this measure cannot be considered a Government measure. It is a measure of which His Majesty's Government as a whole can neither approve nor disapprove. The question is one on which I cannot pledge any individual Member on the Front Bench. I venture, however, on my own behalf, to say that the right rev. Prelate has my sincere sympathy. I recognise in his Bill his good intentions and, knowing Wales as I do, I appreciate the difficulties that are experienced there in the promotion of the efficiency of education. Therefore, if the right rev. Prelate presses the Bill to a division, I shall go into the Lobby with him. But I would ask him not to press your Lordships to a division on this occasion. I do not think any benefit could result from such a step, inasmuch as there are so many important matters of detail, even one of which any division would fail to settle. While I shall follow the right rev. Prelate into the Division Lobby in favour of the Bill if he takes it to a Second Reading, I cannot admit for one moment that any universal or general departure from the Act of 1902 can be accepted by His Majesty's Government without very careful consideration. If it were found possible, while maintaining religious instruction in the voluntary schools as secured by the Act of 1902, to arrive at some agreement agreeable to all sections of the community for promoting the cause of education and restoring good feeling, the Government would not only consider, but they would be anxious to further such a scheme. But until that time arrives it is impossible for the Government to depart from the position laid down in the Act of 1902. I trust that the answer I have given has not disappointed the right rev. Prelate, whose endeavours to promote the efficiency of education in Wales I fully appreciate.

*LORD TWEEDMOUTH: My Lords, I desire in the first instance to say that I find that the noble Marquess was right with regard to what Mr. Lloyd-George said. He did state in the House of Commons that so far as Wales was concerned he would be prepared to accept the Scottish system; but, my Lords, I do not think it is much good talking about the Scottish system being accepted for Wales only, for we know perfectly well that we should not find in England that acceptance which, if Mr. Lloyd-George is right, would be found in Wales. I was not surprised at the reluctance of the noble Marquess to rise after the speech of the right rev. Prelate. Apparently he was waiting for noble Lords from other parts of the House to inform his mind as to what should be said with regard to this Bill. The noble Marquess, in the most frank and open way, announced that the Government once more had no settled convictions on a great subject. I think this makes the fourth subject which we have had recently on which the Government have no settled convictions—there is the question of fiscal reform, there is the question of reform of the War Office, there is the Irish Catholic University question, and now there is the basis of a *concordat* to settle this much disputed question of religious teaching in voluntary schools. The noble Marquess said that he was forced to the position he had taken up by the Opposition. For a member of a powerful Ministry, such as there is in office now, to say that the Opposition had forced him to a particular course seems to me to be the most curious confession of weakness that was ever made by a Minister.

THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY: I beg the noble Lord's pardon. What I pointed out was that if this Bill was to become the law of the land it must be by common consent, that it could not be carried into law unless your Lordships' House was more or less unanimous on the subject.

*LORD TWEEDMOUTH: I do not see that this Bill is in a different position from any other Bill. The people who are responsible for legislation are the Ministry in office, and when the Ministry in office has a huge majority in the Lower House of Parliament and a still greater majority in this House, surely it is not fair to try to shuffle off the responsibility on to a "miserable remnant of an Opposition," for we are constantly being informed that we are only a miserable remnant. Therefore, I think we have a right to disclaim responsibility put on our shoulders which we certainly have done nothing to deserve. Like the noble Marquess, I am very sorry that my noble friend Lord Spencer, a predecessor of his in the distinguished office he holds, is not here to-night, because he could deal with this subject with far greater knowledge than I can pretend to possess; but I think the position of my noble friend on the last occasion when this Bill was before the House has been somewhat misrepresented. All that my noble friend said was that there were particular points in the Bill which would be met by hostility. That was all he said, and I think we can say the same thing now.

There are points in this Bill which will be met with hostility, but the principle is one to which we take no exception whatever. It is a Bill which may perfectly fairly form the basis of some arrangement in the future. For my own part, and speaking for those who sit beside me, I can tell the noble Marquess that he is mistaken in regard to the position we take up on this Bill. We shall certainly not oppose the Second Reading. It is quite true we do find fault with the details of the measure. In the first place, we think that the Bill is too small, that it is not sufficiently comprehensive; it only professes to deal with one of three important points. The Bill deals only, and then only to a small extent, with the question of denominational religious teaching in the schools throughout the country, but there are other questions which will have to be considered before a final settlement can be arrived at. There are the questions of the teachers' tests and of management in the non-provided schools. I do not wish to raise these questions to-day. All I say is that in our judgment there cannot be a final settlement of the question till those matters are also taken into consideration and are dealt with in no aggressive spirit. I think on all these questions there is plenty of room for argument, plenty of room for compromise, plenty of room for agreement; but there cannot be a final settlement until these questions are dealt with and considered. And I am bound to say that I do not believe their fair consideration is possible so long as the present Parliament exists, and until we have gone to the electors of this country to obtain from them a mandate as to how these weighty matters should be dealt with.

I say, then, that the first criticism I have is that the Bill is not sufficiently comprehensive. Then I think it is vague: there is no element of compulsion in it. My belief is that for an arrangement of this sort to be satisfactory and sufficient it ought to be imposed on all schools alike. It should not be left to a mere question of local option as to whether it should be adopted or not. It is quite true that in Wales, under the circumstances that exist there, it is possible that it may be acceptable to the Church authorities that a permissive arrangement of this sort should be made law, and probably it might, in Wales, be a settlement of the difficulty; but we have also got to consider England, and the question I would like to put in all moderation is, would either of the parties in England be satisfied with an arrangement on the lines in this Bill? Do you think English Nonconformists would not look upon it with some suspicion, and do you think that the majority of Church people in England would be content to accept an arrangement which certainly places them in a position a good deal less favourable than the position they are in under the Act at present? I hope it may be that the majority of them will be willing to come down from the position they have taken up, and regard this question as one which, as the noble Marquess has said, should be kept out of the region of political strife and should be dealt with simply and entirely from the point of view of the children who have to be educated.

I was very glad to welcome in the former debate the speech that was made by the most rev. Primate. He, I think, laid down three conditions, or said there were three principles to which he gave adhesion, and I equally give adhesion to those principles. First, he said that simple religious teaching should prevail throughout our elementary school system. To that I personally would give my fullest adhesion. He said, secondly, that the religious teaching should be given by those who would give it genuinely as well as effectively. Certainly, in the broad sense, I would accept that; but, my Lords, I could not allow that that principle should be so interpreted that the test of being able to give genuine and effective religious teaching is, that the teacher should belong to one particular denomination. I think that the capacity to give such in an elementary school belongs to members of all denominations, and that all denominations should be treated exactly alike in considering the qualifications of individual teachers for religious teaching in our elementary schools. Then the most rev. Primate said that in our elementary educational system, as a whole, place should be found for denominational teaching of some sort. Again I agree, but I agree only on this condition, that no charge for such teaching should be thrown on the rates, but should be borne entirely by the particular denomination which is giving that teaching.

I think the best test of the way this Bill would work would be to try and see what would happen supposing it were made compulsory instead of being permissive as at is at present. If the scheme were universally adopted there would be only one class of school, which would be entirely controlled and managed by the public, it would be free from religious tests, and for its normal religious instruction would offer the present undenominational teaching. At the same time, either as an alternative or a supplement to this, there would be given denominational teaching in school hours, to those children whose parents desire it, but not at the public cost. So far would the Cowper-Temple clause be modified. I do not say that it is necessary to maintain every detail of the Cowper-Temple clause for ever, but it does seem to me that in order to secure the satisfactory working of a Bill such as this, the Bill should be made universal and apply to all schools, and denominational teaching should not be given within school hours. I do think it very difficult to allow denominational teaching to be given within school hours. I myself, curiously enough, have at my very gates a school where the system I advocate has been in operation for a very long time. It is a Board school in the Highlands, in a district where there are a great many Catholics. There is the usual religious teaching at the beginning of the day's work, to which the scholars go or not as they please, and if they do not attend no remark is made, and they are not treated in any derogatory way for not attending, What happens with regard to the Catholic children is that a priest visits the school two or three times a week after school hours and gives the children instruction in the tenets of the Roman Catholic faith. That is taking place in a Presbyterian school in a Presbyterian country, and the system has worked perfectly easily and perfectly well. I believe the same thing would be found to work in other places with regard to other denominations which certainly are not nearly so far apart as Roman Catholics and Presbyterians. I wish to make it perfectly clear that I do not think that denominational education should be given during school hours, that I think the proposals in the Bill should be made general to the schools, and that denominational teaching should be charged on the denominations and not on the rates. I believe myself that, so far as this particular question is concerned, the Bill may perfectly well be made the basis of an agreement. I welcome it, to use the noble Marquess's expression, as an eirenicon—I mean by that a message of peace, and I hope that later it will be possible to expand it into a *concordat.*

*THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: My Lords, I was one of those who, when this Bill was before your Lordships eight weeks ago, spoke pretty fully as regards the general principles which underlie every endeavour of this sort, and I do not find in anything that has yet been said to-night any reason to modify what I said at that time as to my own view of the proposals of the right rev. Prelate who introduced this Bill. His wide knowledge of the whole subject and the tone which he has throughout adopted, not merely in this House, but in more trying circumstances outside its walls, would lead everybody to give favourable consideration to any suggestion emanating from him; and I for one rejoice to have heard to-night from the Opposition side of the House a more favourable reception given to the Bill, in general terms, at any rate, than that with which it was favoured on the occasion of the First Reading by the noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition, whose absence we now so greatly regret. At the same time I think it is true to say that the discussion to-night does resolve itself into something not far from an academic character, because it is difficult for any one to imagine that a Bill which is to be criticised with the kind of raking comment which this measure has received to-night from my noble friend who has just spoken would have much chance of being carried through both Houses of Parliament in the present condition of affairs.

I should like to say how greatly I welcome the words which have fallen from the noble Lord opposite, Lord Tweedmouth, as to the three conditions which I vainly endeavoured to make the basis of a conference with Nonconformist leaders some months ago. Had I received from those who I then approached a similar acceptance of the large principles without going into their details, the circumstances might have been somewhat different to-day. I venture to think that the noble Lord, probably through lack of intimate personal experience of such schools, experience which it is difficult for any one of your Lordships except those who sit upon these Benches to have had, scarcely realises the vital importance of the difference between religious teaching inside and religious teaching outside school hours. If the noble Lord will pardon a personal reminiscence, I should like to remind him that a good many years ago I had the pleasure of visiting the particular school to which he has referred and which is situated near the gates of the noble Lord's residence in Scotland. I therefore know something of the very peculiar conditions under which it is carried on, and anything less like the condition of things which prevail in the large towns, say, in South London, or Leeds, or Birmingham, than the conditions which prevail in Inverness-shire, it is scarcely possible to imagine. While I do not want to go into a question of this detail, although it is detail of the highest importance, it would, so far as I can at present see, be impossible for us to give way on this particular point. We are anxious to have the religious teaching given within school hours, because thus only can it in our judgment be effectively given to those for whom the need is greatest.

I was particularly thankful to hear the noble Lord say that he does not adhere to the principle, so constantly repeated by those who seem to be leaders on the side he represents, that it is contrary to sound Liberal principles to make any inquiry whatever as to the religious tenets of a person who is to give religious instruction. I understand the noble Lord's contention to be that to inquire as to the denomination of a teacher is one thing and to inquire as to his power to give instruction is another; but I could furnish the noble Lord with quotation after quotation from the accredited and responsible protagonists on the other side, who have used words which are quite incompatable with what the noble Lord has this evening, to my great satisfaction, said. I shall rejoice if the noble Lord's words to-night are the signal of a new departure among those who have, in a way that has disappointed most of us, declined to allow that it was compatible with large and liberal principles in this matter to find out whether or not a teacher who is to give religious instruction is competent to give it from his heart as something which he believes.

I regret, however, to hear the talk about "two sides" in this controversy. It is a controversy largely carried on among those whose special task it is to set forth the doctrines of the Christian faith in England, and it is deplorable to hear "two sides" spoken of in a controversy of this kind, while at the bottom of the hearts of those who are contending there is practical agreement in the desire to see religious teaching maintained in our schools. But, my Lords, we do need to ascertain how far we are at one as to practical policy. For it would be a farce to pretend that a Bill of this kind laying down principles upon which a *concordat* could proceed would be worth anything unless it be accepted with considerable cordiality by both parties to the controversy. While what we have heard to-night qualifies to some degree the opposition which such proposals have hitherto met with, I shall be agreeably surprised if we learn that so great a change takes place as to enable those who have been opposing us hitherto to join us in carrying forward a measure on the lines of this Bill. However anxious we may be for a peaceful solution, we dare not shut our eyes to the modes of argument which are being everywhere employed, and I must confess that it is very difficult to carry on a controversy of this kind amid misrepresentations, taunts, and denunciations on the part of those who are trying to oppose us in this matter. The utterances do not come merely from the irresponsible Members of the other party to the controversy; they come from the responsible spokesmen of a great Party in the State which has been endeavouring to set forth the principles of what it strangely describes as religious liberty. Here are a few examples of the kind of utterances to which I refer—

> "Nonconformists will never stop their warfare until they have completely disestablished the Church."
>
> "This Bill takes the Board schools from the people and gives them over, roughly speaking, to one section of the people, the Anglican Church."
>
> "What is at stake is not education, but the inalienable birthright of the citizen, the right to the free, unfettered use of his inmost soul."

I rejoice to hear this evening from the Opposition side a different tone, and I welcome it from the bottom of my heart.

May I say a word or two upon the larger question which is involved although I doubt whether there would be a very wide difference of opinion among your Lordships upon it. It is, of course, perfectly possible for the Church of England to make over bodily to the nation as a free gift, the whole of the schools which have been with immense sacrifice and at enormous cost erected by the members of the Church of England. Their value is variously estimated, but I imagine that £20,000,000 is a very moderate estimate indeed. But if we were to do this it would have to be because we had obtained absolute assurances that the principles of the cause for which we have incurred this enormous cost of labour and self-sacrifice, mainly on the part of the clergy, to maintain these schools were absolutely assured for the time to come at the very least as firmly as they are assured now. That is the assurance we ought to be able to obtain before we are even asked to withdraw from a position which the fairness and common sense of Englishmen, apart from religious principle, would feel that we have a right to retain, and we are certain we are doing nothing unfair when we claim to have a predominant say as to the character of the religious teaching which is for the future to be given in our schools.

We are constantly asked, "Why not trust the common sense of the people at large?" I have great sympathy with that argument. I believe that if we were allowed to put it freely to the test the underlying principles of religious purpose which characterise the English people would prevail to maintain in the vast majority of cases the kind of teaching we should desire to see given in our elementary schools, but what we are asked to do is not that. We are asked to bid the English people go into the settlement of the controversy with one hand tied. It is suggested that we should say to the public, "You take the schools over, but the teaching in them must be of a particular character." And it is because the thing we are asked to do does not consist in trusting the people freely, but rather in half trusting the people, that I for one feel the most intense difficulty in giving practical effect to principles which in their abstract and general sense we cordially approve.

Then again we are constantly asked, "Why should you not be satisfied with the kind of teaching given in the Board schools? Surely it is good on the whole." That argument is constantly accompanied by a kind of easy reference to the school boards of London, Birmingham, Liverpool, and other places of that sort. But there is the widest possible contrast between the religious teaching given under such auspices as those and the religious teaching given in recent years in the smaller, less responsible, less splendidly-manned kind of Board schools up and down the country. Your Lordships will remember that in 1895 a Parliamentary Return was published, showing what was nominally the religious teaching given in the Board schools of England and Wales.

That Return shows that in 1895 fifty-seven school board districts in England and Wales had absolutely no religious teaching of any kind at all, that 316 others read the Bible with no word of comment (which practically means for little children no instruction at all as to what the Bible means), and there were something like 700 districts in which the religious teaching given was not inspected at all. And that lack of inspection makes the teaching given in many cases practically worthless. The last thing I desire publicly to do is to give specimens in an argument of this kind which might prove to be irritating rather than helpful; but I should be ready, if necessary, to show that religious teaching has been practically non-existent in a large number of places, where the Blue-book says it does exist—non-existent because there was no inspection and nobody whose business it was to see that the instruction was properly given. There, again, comes in the question of Scotland. The Scottish people are a more religious people in the mass than the English, there is more interest taken in theological subjects by the people in Scotland than in England, and for many years the religious teaching given in the board schools in Scotland was excellent, partly owing to the thorough training of the teachers in religious matters, and partly to the popular demand for it and interest in it. Nowadays, however, for lack of inspection, it is beginning, to dwindle and go down. If your Lordships refer to the reports furnished this very year to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland as to the way in which religious teaching, for lack of inspection by duly appointed religious inspectors, was going down, you will find an object-lesson very full of force and meaning as to what might happen in England if we went forward on similar lines. It is because there is in England a large mass of people who care, with all their heart, for the improvement of their schools in secular matters, but who care yet more for the religious side, and are determined that they shall not only have religious teaching given, but that the value of that teaching shall be inspected, the qualification of the teachers ascertained, and year by year a report rendered to the authorities—it is for that reason that not only in Church schools, but in Board schools, the religious instruction has been so good as it has. There, my Lords, are matters we should bear in mind when we are contemplating a great change in this far-reaching question. The discussion which has taken place to-night is to my mind reassuring, as showing that we are drawing nearer the possibility of arriving at a conclusion which shall maintain in their fulness the fundamental principles for which we care.

*LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY: My Lords, I wish at the outset to say that I do not approach this Bill in any spirit of hostility. Before coming down to the House this afternoon I had made up my mind, after giving the most careful consideration to the Bill, and after reading and re-reading all the speeches delivered on the First Reading, that though I did not think this Bill a possible basis for legislation in this session, there was an opening as to certain concessions of principle which, if accepted, and possibly if debated in Committee, might pave the way to fruitful and effective legislation in the future. And I must say I was a little surprised by what struck me as the change of tone adopted by the noble Marquess the President of the Board of Education.

Speaking at Carnarvon the noble Marquess said that the Government did not assert that the Act of 1902 was perfect, and that they were anxious to secure any solution of this difficult question which should be accepted permanently by all sections of the community. That is a very wise summing-up of what should be the attitude of a Government responsible for the carrying of the Act of 1902, which, as it stands, does not implant in the mind of anyone any confidence either of its permanence or of its satisfactory character. I thought when the noble Marquess laid stress upon the fact that, even when a measure conciliatory in its character was introduced, there was not much hope of dealing with it unless we got substantial agreement on both sides of the House, that the noble Marquess's political instincts were singularly ill-directed. For he told us in the same breath that His Majesty's Government were determined to put forward their Coercion Bill to amend in an important particular the Act of 1902. We are told that the Government would think several times before touching that Act. I ask them to consider seriously before proceeding with the Bill which is now hung up in the House of Commons.

May I touch upon one or two of the observations which fell from the most rev. Primate? I did think that it seemed there was an attempt, both on his part and on the part of the noble Marquess the President of the Board of Education, to run away from responsibility in connection with this Bill, and to attempt to fix the responsibility on this side. There was a special attack made upon the noble Earl who leads the Opposition. I heard the noble Earl's speech, and I thought that it was a most cautious speech, not declaring any general hostility to the Bill, but simply putting in a *caveat* as to the special points with regard to facilities within school hours. The term "within school hours" is one of a very technical and special character. I heard also the speech of the most rev. Primate. Some people give an indication by their reticence which other people give by outspoken remarks, but though the most rev. Primate followed the right rev. Prelate the Bishop of St. Asaph he abstained from saying any word on the question of inside facilities during school hours.

We are told, and I was very glad to hear the testimony from the right rev. Prelate, that in this question the only people who are to be consulted as to the religious instruction of the children are their parents. That was a proposition laid down at the outset in the debates on the Bill of 1902 by Mr. Balfour, but when an attempt was made to secure that these parents should have effective control by being represented on the management of the schools we heard an entirely different story, and the only people who were allowed to be represented were the clergy and the subscribers—the foundation managers. If you said that in every school district the parents should elect two out of the four foundation managers, that would give a very substantial voice to the parents, but the most rev. Primate told us that what succeeded in the case of the Highlands would not succeed in England, for he told us that the great masses of the working classes in our great towns are singularly indifferent to ecclesiastical denominations. But that rather indicates that all this desire is not a desire so much on behalf of the parents as a desire for the parents, to do good to them, not to give effect to their wishes.

THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: What I was speaking of as the indifference of parents in large towns was not to religious education merely, but to education of all kinds.

*LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY: I cannot contend with the most rev. Primate in his knowledge of schools in general, but I have some knowledge of the attitude of parents in the poorest parts of London as well as in the more well-to-do, and, while I should entirely agree with him as to the great indifference of parents to theological distinctions, I am happy to say that, largely as the result of the devoted labours of the teachers, a very keen sense of the value of the schools has been built up among the parents, and there is a gradually increasing desire on their part to send their children regularly and punctually to school. There were several controversial matters introduced in the speech of the most rev. Primate which I will not touch upon, partly because if I open all the points which might be dealt with my observations would be too long, and partly because I wish to keep strictly to such words as may help to lead to an ultimate settlement of this question. May I say without flattery of the right rev. Prelate, who has moved the Second Reading of the Bill, that I think his speech goes to the root of the matter, and shows an appreciation of the difficulty and seriousness of the problem, and how it ought to be met. I feel perfectly sure that quite apart from the wrangling and disputes of the Churches, there is a body in this country which has not yet been referred to, but which is more important, and in the long run will be more powerful than either Church or Chapel, and that is the body of the citizenship of this country, and it is because I look forward to resting our public school system, as it is in all the great communities of the English-speaking race, upon the broad basis of citizenship, that I welcome the recognition by the mover of this Bill that the ultimate settlement must be the public management of all the schools which are available and intended for the community as a whole.

I quite recognise at the same time that the right rev. Prelate and those who act with him have a right to say that this is not a newly colonised country where the whole thing is being started afresh. This is a country where great vested interests have been built up, partly no doubt by the self-sacrifice of those who believed in distinctive forms of religious teaching, and you cannot expect to step into their inheritance and take possession of these schools in the same way that you would if you were starting fresh schools. Therefore, I maintain that in the case of those schools the present managers have a partial ownership over them, that there is a collateral ownership belonging to the denominations who erected them. The right rev. Prelate in charge of this Bill, and I think I may say the most rev. Primate, though in a more guarded way, recognise that you must have a universal system of publicly managed schools, and they claim at the same time that you must have a recognition of facilities for giving definite religious instruction to those who desire it in accordance with the wishes of the founders of those schools. But they both go a step further than that. They both desire to imprint upon all the schools in the country in the first instance, and at the public expense, a system of undenominational religious teaching. I take it from the speech of the right rev. Prelate that a syllabus such as that of the School Board for London faithfully and efficiently carried out would satisfy him very largely. For many years I have been a party to administering that syllabus, and it is not for me to fall out with right rev. Prelates when they propose to establish that——

THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: If the noble Lord thinks he is quoting me he is going beyond anything I have endeavoured to say.

*LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY: I should be very sorry to misrepresent anyone, but part of the scheme of the right rev. Prelate is that in consideration of making over the aided schools they should make a bargain that in the provided schools generally they may stipulate for a scheme of general religious instruction which would satisfy them apart from the question of facilities for definite religious instruction. The first principle laid down by the most rev. Primate was simple religious teaching to prevail throughout our elementary school system, that is, the establishment of a general undenominational syllabus. The Archbishop of Canterbury shakes his head, but if he will write to *The Times* and give a sketch of his simple religious syllabus which is to be in force in every school, he will render valuable assistance. I expect it would hardly contain that which when Bishop of Winchester he was a party to introducing into the school board at Farnham, namely, the Apostles' Creed.

That is the interpretation I put upon his words "simple religious instruction to prevail in all the schools." Where I pause is here. There is a strong section of those who are most devoted to Church principles to whom this solution is absolutely abhorrent. It is particularly abhorrent to the National Society, whose official organ it has been my painful duty to read for many years. If that section of the community are modifying their views, and if they are going now to say that the one form of religion which is to have State patronage, and to be picked out as being maintained at the public expense is this general undenominational teaching, I should not oppose them, though, I think, the Anglican has as much right to claim that the minimum of Christianity shall not be taught at his expense as the unsectarian has to claim that the maximum of Christianity shall not be taught at his expense. I believe that the majority of the bench of Bishops would prefer general Bible teaching to none. I believe that most of the clergy, when they are not engaged in abusing school board religion, in order to keep out a school board, would prefer it, and I believe the majority of the people of England prefer it. But there is a great difference between letting responsibility rest with the local education authority as to the amount of religious teaching to be given and in putting it in an Act of Parliament. That would be with a vengeance an affirmation of State religion in our elementary schools.

May I now touch upon the Archbishop's three conditions? He says I have not done justice to his first condition. I shall await a fuller exposition of what it is, although I think I have put the fairest and most natural interpretation upon it. The second condition was that religious teaching must be given by those who can give it genuinely and effectively. I dissent from the Archbishop's analogy of the teaching of drawing. I contend that the teaching of religion does not rest on the same footing as drawing. When you come to teach the foundations of moral conduct, there is no doubt that the convictions and the feelings of the teacher are as vital as his knowledge; but I ask your Lordships does anyone imagine that with the education authority you have you are going in any way to introduce, even if it were desirable, an inquisition into the piety and holiness of the people employed to teach in your elementary schools. We went into all this in the School Board for London, and we saw it was ridiculous. You cannot allow an inquiry into people's religious convictions. We do not allow people to ask, "Are you of any denomination," and that is the usual feeling of the people of this country.

You would not get laymen elected by the community to consent for one minute to an inquisition into the religious belief of the people they employ in the elementary schools, but the more you insist on the fact that the people who teach things which are to appeal to the conscience and the heart should be people in earnest in what they teach the more you are thrown back on severing that part of the teaching from secular teaching and giving it to people who believe in it, and are chosen by the Churches and not by the community. I do not know that even a small religious community are always successful. I see before me the noble Viscount under whom I had the pleasure of serving for a long time on the Education Commission, and he will remember we sent the most searching questions to the managers of schools throughout the country, and we found that the returns showed that a far larger percentage of the managers of schools of the Church of England admitted that they habitually suspended religious instruction when the Government examination was drawing near, than was the case in the Board schools. I do not believe myself that in choosing teachers for the ordinary work you will be able to get people whom the various denominations would entrust with the duty of speaking upon religious matters to the children, and you had better abandon that idea; but if, of course, you are willing to take the responsibility yourself, if the clergyman of the parish is willing—and I am afraid a large percentage of the clergymen are not—to go into the schools, say, at nine o'clock in the morning and take part themselves in the teaching, then you will get a person who is presumably fit to talk seriously and thoughtfully to the children.

The third point was that in our educational system as a whole place should be found for denominational teaching of some sort. I put it to the right rev. Bench. Is not the idea "in school hours" technically a weak staff to lean upon? You may have the instruction given out of official school hours and yet at a most convenient time. The right rev. Prelate who moved the Second Reading of this Bill used the illustration of the Drury Lane School, but he forgot that this school is under a different Act, and that the registration of children according to denominations is compulsory. But if he wants an illustration of what can be done in the way of voluntary religious instruction when people are in earnest, I would recommend him to turn his attention to the schools frequented by the Jews in the East End of London. There is no doubt the Jews are very tenacious of their religious convictions, and anxious that the children should be fully brought up in them. The Jews have organised at their own expense in the East End a voluntary organisation, and the School Board, and now the County Council, have put at their disposal the use of the buildings, with no charge for warming or lighting, but outside school hours. I believe that when there is a keen desire you will have that; but the fact is, there is no use disguising it, that there is not that keen desire; and this desire, whether it is for denominational or undenominational teaching is put forward on behalf of the people, and not by the people.

The noble Marquess said the Bill had his sympathy. I think in these things we want a little more than sympathy. We want support, and I am prepared to support the right rev. Prelate. I do not think he has thought out his Bill sufficiently. It would not be suitable to go into the details of the Bill now. That is a matter for Committee, but I shall be prepared to show that this Bill in no way gives effect to the wishes the right rev. Prelate has expressed in his speech. So far from giving greater facilities to the public authority for the transfer of schools, it rather puts difficulties in the way. It proposes arrangements which, while I have no doubt they will be used in good faith by the right rev. Prelate, might be used in very serious bad faith to throw a burden on the community and afterwards to regain use of the schools. I would not have made that charge unless I had an instance to give which I think illustrates the mischief that might come from these permissive transfers with the power of breaking down the obligations of the Act of Parliament as to rent, purchase, and cost of repairs.

The newspapers of late have been very full of letters of indignation on behalf of the Church of England against what was supposed to be a very mischievous concession made in the Isle of Wight, where certain Church schools were to be given over; but when your Lordships know what were the facts about that school in

Cowes, you would think the indignation ought to come rather from the Nonconformists and ratepayers than from the Established Church. I have in my hand the agreement, and it goes on to recite that the freehold of this school is vested in the Bishop, and that whereas the foundation managers of the said school are quite unable to provide or to raise the large sum of money which, according to independent reports of the surveyor for the local education authority and of the Voluntary Schools Association will have to be spent to bring the school premises into proper condition for the purposes of education, and whereas the said managers have made every effort to raise such money but have failed, then it is proposed that the school shall be transferred, that the public authority shall put the schools in repair, that after a certain time the agreement may contemplate the schools being taken back by the voluntary managers, but the public authority are to have no lien on the buildings so put in repair when they are restored to the voluntary managers.

The most rev. Primate spoke of the unfair statements made outside your Lordships' House. Would he think it hard if I were to say outside the House, as I say inside the House, that we must be very careful not to allow the public to be plundered in order that insanitary voluntary schools may be put into repair and then handed back to the owners, because that is what was proposed at Cowes. I wish to remind the right rev. Prelate, before sitting down, of a fact which I am sure the noble Marquess the President of the Board of Education will endorse, that he must not imagine that by putting in his Bill the provision that these schools shall not be affected by the Transfer Clause of the Act of 1902, which makes such a school a new school, he is going to get his school back. I am quite sure many of the right rev. Prelates here know perfectly well that the school and the schoolhouse are two different things. The school is like the church, a congregation of faithful men; the schoolhouse is the building in which that congregation are assembled, and the transfer of the school is the transfer of the organisation with the children and their teaching staff. The mere fact that they are taught for some time in temporary premises does not oust the public authority from the responsible duty and right of continuing the education of these children as an existing school and not as a new school if, from any circumstances, they should be deprived of their premises.

We have constantly in London taken over voluntary schools for a time until a proper school could be provided, but we never recognised that, merely because the building went back to the voluntary owners, the children went back too. The children were ours and we continued to educate them. I would ask right rev. Prelates, Do they not believe that in the rural districts of Wales, where the single school system prevails, there will be always be two-thirds or three-fourths, perhaps nine-tenths, of the parents who are not members of the Established Church? Is it not natural that these people should wish, not for a short time but permanently, that they should have a voice in the management of the schools, and that the positions of headmaster and headmistress should be open to their co-religionists. You must come to that, and I do not hesitate to say that the longer this controversy goes on the more the people of this country will be determined that the public school system shall rest upon a civic and not an ecclesiastical basis.

Lord NORTON: My Lords, this is a subject in which I have all my life taken the keenest interest. Half a century ago I was Vice-President of the Education Committee's Council, and even before that I spent many years in promoting the voluntary system. I have seen how the subject of national education has been necessarily taken up by the State, and the danger to this country in the State undertaking the most intimate matters of individual and domestic concern, the most important of which is that of religious education. I believe that if the State steps in *in loco parentis* the character of the country will become changed. When Mr. Forster introduced by the Act of 1870 rate-support of education, he was afraid it would produce the religious difficulty, and only hoped it would not become an anti-religious difficulty. Anything that offers an opening for getting rid of this difficulty is of the greatest importance. The Bill now before us shews how the difficulty may be voluntarily got over in one locality, and so indicates a principle which might be followed.

There is a unanimous feeling, strongly expressed by the noble Marquess, the President of the Board of Education, and by two noble Lords who have spoken on the other side of the House, in favour of the principle of this Bill, the object of which is to get religious teaching into all our schools, and not separately taught in denominational schools. As long as there are two separate sets of schools it becomes a matter of contest, and it is a very unequal contest. The process of division which has gone on since the State interfered has tended to eliminate from national education the principal part of it—the religious instruction; and it is now by many avowed that the object of national education is simply to fit the rising generation to compete with foreigners in commercial markets. It is clear, from what fell from the noble Lord who has just sat down, that he would propose purely secular instruction in all the schools in the country, and leave religious instruction to the various denominations. Lord Tweedmouth said he objected to the Bill because it was not universal. The merit of this Bill is that it does not attempt to be at once universal. This is a statement which must be first deat with locally, in the hope that the *concordat* adopted locally may gradually spread. To propose a universal *concordat* at once is to propose postponing indefinitely the question. This difficulty will, of course, settle itself, as all questions in this practical country do settle themselves. But how? By the entire sacrifice of the non-provided schools. They are sinking now as a result of the pressure upon them. It will be found absolutely impossible to carry on a system in which one body are called upon to support, out of their own resources, an unequal contest with public funds to which they also have to contribute. The voluntary schools are already beginning to suffer through the loss of support. The consequent partnership in undertaking between the public purse and the private purse is one that cannot long be sustained, and therefore the principle of united action in the right rev. Prelate's Bill is necessary to permanency. I hope the voting on this Bill will be perfectly free. I understood the noble Marquess to say that he would support the Second Reading.

THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY: On personal grounds.

*LORD NORTON: Then, so far as the Government is concerned, it may be considered an open question. I shall certainly support the Second Reading, and urge your Lordships to consider whether the Bill will not offer a scheme for removing the religious difficulty, without losing the main object of national education. All the objections which have been made during this debate are objections which could be very well dealt with by a Select Committee.

*THE LORD BISHOP OF ROCHESTER: My Lords, I do not know that this debate can be said to have been a very lively one. At the same time I cannot help thinking that a disinterested spectator would be able to derive from it some measure of entertainment; for I think it has taken, in some degree, the character of what I might call "a fishing debate." I have observed a certain tendency in all the speakers to see what they could get out of the other side, and to register on the tablets of the memory something for future use. The debate has assumed that character, because the object with which the Bill is moved is to express a sentiment, rather than to clothe that sentiment with any particular form of substance. Of course, you must have a Bill, and when you have a Bill, you must have clauses, and the clauses must have a meaning; but I do think it is true to say that the value of the right rev. Prelate's Bill is to give expression to some kind of readiness on the part of different interests to look fairly at any suggestions of re-arrangement or compromise. The noble Lord opposite, in a genial way, threw in, if I understood him rightly, a little taunt at us for being so soon ready for this after the Act of 1902. I own that I did not feel very much moved by that taunt. I think the Act of 1902 may at least be said to have done this. It has left what I may perhaps call, for short, the denominational factor in religious education in a very different position from that in which it found it. I, for my part, am prepared to face the noble Lord's taunt and to say that we should be ready to look very carefully at any serious proposal to give effect to the various forms of religious conviction which exist in the nation.

I do not think that those who care for the sacred interests of religion can be the least indifferent to a condition of things in which religious men find themselves in vehement opposition. I hope I am not saying too much if I say that we should feel this even more, had the controversy on the other side been conducted in the country with more respect for the religious convictions which we hold, if the weapons used against us had been less the weapons of virulence and abuse, and if the movement had not taken so strongly political a character. I feel sure there are multitudes of those whom the Bishop represents, who are in that attitude towards compromise, and therefore I suppose our way of expressing that sentiment is to join the right rev. Primate in supporting the Second Reading of this Bill. But I think we must be a little careful as to what we do not do as well as to what we do. I think that we must not attribute too much to incidental expressions on either side, and still less to the use made by the opposite side in either case of those expressions. It would, for example, be rather startling if the people of this country, on reading the newspapers to-morrow morning, should imagine the most rev. Primate at this time of day committed, as it would learn from the noble Lord opposite, to a universal system of undenominational education. It would, perhaps, be a little surprising, on the other hand, to the noble Lord himself, if it were found that a very kindly, and, in my opinion, very thoughtful expression, which he used about the logic of the religious situation, bound him for all time to the support of denominational instruction by the State on exactly the same terms as the support of undenominational instruction. That is, by the way, what this Bill does not do.

It is unfortunate that the noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition, did on the occasion of the First Reading plump down his foot, if I may say so, upon an objection to the Bill without looking more generally to see what elements of a possible solution it contained; but it is very satisfactory that the discussion to-night has gone the other way. The real reason why the debate takes this form is, if I am not mistaken, that when you have a great question like this in the position in which this question now stands, you can only attempt compromise when the pressure of circumstances drives you that way. It is notorious that in the present state of business the Bill cannot be made law this session, neither do circumstances at this moment suggest the possibility of any general compromise throughout the country. The most rev. Primate has reminded your Lordships that in the course of last year he did, rather boldly, come forward to suggest that it was not hopeless for us to consider, charitably and unitedly, with those to whom we were in a great measure opposed, the terms of some *concordat*. I think that in trying to get down to the root principles of the matter and below the current controversies he took the risk of the very criticism which the noble Lord has made. He made what was a very honourable offer, but was the result such as to lead us to think that the moment was ripe for a compromise? I have every possible respect for the services which have been rendered by the noble Lord opposite to London education, but I have always thought he appeared to insist on the unbending system of universal undenominationalism which is the greatest bar to a solution of this question. I hope the time will come when the noble Lord and those he represents will be willing to go into the discussion on more hopeful lines. The Second Reading of this Bill in the meantime can do no more than affirm the general desire that the ultimate solution, whether it be next year or a few years later, shall be a solution arising not from the victory of one party or the other but from something which will do justice to the feeling of the different contending parties.

Lord RIBBLESDALE: My Lords, I only intervene in this debate for a few moments. I am afraid the concluding words of the right rev. Prelate whom we always hear with such interest recommend us to a council of perfection which we are very unlikely to see acted upon in this country. But as I understand, he construes the attitude of your Lordships' House to-night as one in cordial agreement with the sentiment which is incarnated in this Bill, but speaking generally he thinks that a Resolution of the House would have been as effective as this Bill. Enough has been said, and very well said, on the merits and demerits of this Bill. The only thing I wish to say is that it seems to me, after the approval given to the Bill by the noble Marquess the Minister for Education, that the Bill should have been introduced by His Majesty's Government and not have been left to a private Member. I daresay it is due to some deficiency in my own intelligence, but I find myself in some confusion of mind about the exact position of His Majesty's Government on this Bill, and, as I daresay some other noble Lord on the Front Bench opposite will wind up this debate, I hope he will make that position clear. It is the noble Marquess who produces this confusion of mind. He began by telling us that nothing was to be done in this direction without the unanimous consent of your Lordships' House. I may say that a good many things have been done in this House, with, no doubt, unanimous and cordial acceptance on the part of noble Lords opposite, but which have met with very little support on this side.

THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY: I am sorry to interrupt the noble Lord. I anticipated that we should have heard from the Front Bench opposite views in accord with those which the noble Earl, the Leader of the Opposition, expressed on the First Reading, and consequently, after that statement in which the noble Earl declared his hostility to the measure, it was with great surprise that I heard noble Lords opposite state that they accepted it.

*LORD RIBBLESDALE: I am afraid I cannot enter into the noble Marquess' difficulties, but he cannot have been quite unprepared, for I understand that a whip was sent out to bring noble Lords down to this debate. But, be that as it may, I pass to the confusion of mind in which I find myself as to the opinion of the Government. The noble Marquess first told us that your Lordships' House should not be urged to divide on this Bill. Then he told us that His Majesty's Government could give no definite answer as to what was their view of the Bill, and he next stated that he himself would follow the right rev. Prelate into the Lobby in support of the Second Reading should the Bill go to a division. This exhibits an agreeable detachment of mind on grave questions to which His Majesty's Government have of late made us tolerably accustomed. But what I want to know is, in what capacity did the noble Marquess address us, and in what capacity will he vote? He told us just now that he was going to vote as a private Member, and an admirer of the right rev. Prelate and of his work in Wales. But the noble Marquess is Minister of Education, and as such we know he has the interests and the morals of education deeply at heart. Is his vote tempered at all by his views as Minister of Education? Does he divorce himself from his position as Minister of Education.

THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY: I think I clearly pointed out that this Bill is a private Bill introduced entirely on the responsibility of the right rev. Prelate, on which I was not speaking as a member of His Majesty's Government and on which no member of the Government need have spoken. I have explained why on personal grounds the right rev. Prelate having introduced this Bill rather in accordance with a suggestion I made at Carnarvon, I shall go into the lobby in support of the Second Reading.

*LORD RIBBLESDALE: That is what I complain of. It is a private Bill and we think it ought to have been a public Bill, as the noble Marquess made such a strong point of its being a desirable Bill. However, I understand that the noble Marquess is speaking as a private Member and not as a member of a Ministry of many talents, but with no settled convictions. But we on this side really mean business. We think this is a desirable *locus standi* for arriving at a solution. It seems to me there is, then, the unanimous acceptance all round the noble Marquess insists upon. Everybody agrees that the Bill offers a sort of jumping-off place for the closing of long-standing wrangles and disputes, which, to use the words of the right rev. Prelate who introduced the Bill, are "gaunt and irritating" to a great many people, and which, in my opinion, would justify some later day Tertullian to say with all Tertullian's irony, "See how these Christians love one another." If we go to a division I shall cordially support the Second Reading.

*THE LORD BISHOP OF HEREFORD: My Lords, I feel somewhat shy of prolonging this interesting discussion, partly because it is so purely academic. At the same time I desire to add one or two words to what has been said. While I desire to express my sympathy with the right rev. Prelate who has introduced this Bill, I see no chance of its establishing educational peace. Any one who reads the Bill carefully must feel that there is no sort of finality about it; it is purely a piece of patchwork, which could produce no lasting results. As it stands it would be simply attempting a new patch to an old garment. There is another reason why I feel we are somewhat wasting our time in these discussions, and it is this. To my mind it is clear that this is no longer a question for a moribund Parliament to deal with. If it is to be dealt with in any binding and lasting way it must be dealt with by the people at a general election and by a new Parliament. Moreover, as an optional Bill this measure would in many places create more confusion than it would settle. I can understand those who are closely identified with Wales feeling that they would be glad to see a settlement of some kind. The mass of the Welsh people would work it according to Welsh ideas, but over the border they may have entirely different ideas. Therefore I have no hesitation in saying that the Bill would produce endless confusion throughout the length and breadth of the land; and for this reason, that it is optional. As my right rev. brother of Rochester has said, we have listened to a number of fishing speeches. They rather presented themselves to my mind as poaching speeches—speeches in which the speaker was aiming at catching as much as he could on the opposite side of the House. I think this Bill would be worthy of serious and practical consideration subject to the condition precedent that there should be a school under public control and management within a reasonable distance of every parent. Given that condition I believe I could make a reasonable *concordat* on the basis of this Bill.

*THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (The Earl of SELBORNE): My Lords, I cannot help thinking that notwithstanding the Party chaff of my noble friend opposite what has passed to-night will be looked back upon as notable in the history of this controversy. Without any offence or intention of offence to my noble friends opposite I will say that this is the first time they seem to me to have officially spoken with any kindly or unprejudiced appreciation of the point of view of those with whom they do not agree on this question. The attitude of my noble friend opposite really does differ fundamentally from the attitude of the speakers belonging to his Party who have spoken on this question in the country, and also from the tone of the official literature issued by his Party; and it is more remarkable because the noble Lord, Lord Stanley of Alderley, although taking a distinctly different view in some respects from that of my noble friend, frankly accepted this Bill as a basis from which he was willing to work. My noble friend who spoke last on the other side of the House spoke even more strongly in that direction. But I think all these speakers have been unfair in their interpretation of the attitude of my noble friend the President of the Board of Education.

The noble Marquess has reminded your Lordships that this is a private Bill, for which neither the Party opposite nor His Majesty's Government are responsible; and he has a right to feel very considerable satisfaction that the Bill has been the subject of debate here to-night, because, however far it may depart from his own particular ideas in this matter or however near it may approach them, it is the first public attempt in either House of Parliament to take up the lead which he gave at Carnarvon, and, much as it may surprise my noble friend opposite who spoke last, the noble Marquess speaks for all his colleagues. But it does not follow that because a private Bill has received the measure of welcome which my noble friend has accorded to this Bill, the Government should forthwith take it up and pass it through Parliament in this session.

Lord RIBBLESDALE: I do not want to interrupt the noble Earl, but what surprises me is that if the noble Marquess speaks on behalf of his colleagues, why should he not say so?

*The Earl of SELBORNE: I think I have answered my noble friend's Question. This being a private Bill my noble friend behind me took up an attitude which is common in dealing with such matters in both Houses of Parliament. In the present state of public business no Bill, however perfect, has any chance of passing into law in the other House this session. I would like briefly to allude to some points of criticism taken by my noble friend Lord Tweedmouth. I think he admitted that it was a correct quotation from Mr. Lloyd-George that he had accepted the principle of the Scottish system so far as Wales was concerned, but my noble friend added that the case of England is not the same. Later on in his speech he gave us a very interesting illustration of a Scottish school at his park gates, and the most rev. Primate pointed out how utterly different the conditions of that school were from many schools in London. Does not my noble friend opposite see the application of his own criticism and the most rev. Primate's illustration to his complaint that there was no element of compulsion in this Bill? If the case of England is different from that of Wales, if the case of London is different from that of Inverness-shire ought not the main point of policy in any settlement to be not the rigidity demanded by him but flexibility and elasticity.

Is it quite certain that what we want is the smallest measure of devolution to local bodies and the greatest measure of compulsion? May it not be more probable that a solution will be found in the greatest amount of discretion to the local authorities combined with the least possible amount of compulsion? When the Education Act of 1902 was introduced by the Government in the House of Commons, that Bill itself was made compulsory. It was made compulsory in Committee, and I think the whole of the Opposition, the friends of my noble friend opposite, voted against making it compulsory. That shows that the opinions on that side are still in an unsettled condition. My noble friend said the Bill was not sufficiently comprehensive. He quoted especially the fact that there was no provision for popular management of non-provided schools—I will allude to that question later on—and said that the question of tests for teachers was not sufficiently clearly dealt with. There is no time to-night to attempt to deal at any length with that most difficult question; but I think if I interpreted my noble friend's attitude correctly it was this, that he and his friends could not agree to, or countenance, any attempt to press a religious test on a candidate for teachership.

Lord TWEEDMOUTH: Denominational test.

*The Earl of SELBORNE: Any denominational test on a candidate for teachership. But, with that proviso, he quite felt the force of the argument that a teacher should not be required to teach what he or she could not teach conscientiously, and that the teachers themselves should be invited freely to co-operate in doing what they could to make a settlement easier; that is to say, that where they were willing to assist, the distribution of the teachers should be such as to utilise their assistance to the greatest possible extent. I think I might illustrate what I understand to be my noble friend's meaning by saying that he would not think it reasonable that a Presbyterian should be deliberately chosen to teach Roman Catholic children.

Lord TWEEDMOUTH: I specially excluded any denominational test.

*The Earl of SELBORNE: I am not saying anything about tests. Suppose a Presbyterian and a Roman Catholic teacher were equally ready to take part in religious instruction, common sense would say that the Roman Catholic teacher should be set to teach Roman

Catholic children. I would ask your Lordships to observe how this principle was carried out by Lord Stanley of Alderley when he was Vice-Chairman of the School Board for London. He successfully solved the problem, for in the Jewish schools to which he alluded to-night I understand the whole of the teachers appointed by the School Board for London were Jews.

*LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY: You are misinformed. Not a great many years ago a Jewish head teacher was appointed to overcome the prejudices of the Jews. After that Jews were appointed as far as they could be got, because of the language, but of late years it has been a matter of perfect indifference.

*THE EARL OF SELBORNE: Then my noble friend dealt briefly with the principle laid down by the Archbishop of Canterbury in his speech in the last debate. I understood him to say that he did not differ from the right rev. Prelate in the hope that a simple system of religious teaching should universally prevail in any national settlement. He also agreed that the religious teaching should be given genuinely as well as effectively. He also agreed that a place for denominational teaching should be found, provided that the denominational teaching was at the expense of the denomination and not in school hours; and he wound up by saying he was not prepared to contend that there never could be any alteration of any sort in the Cooper-Temple clause. I do think that that is a very notable speech coming from my noble friend, although I admit that in the proviso he has made in respect to the school hours he is at once touching on a difficulty that goes deep down into this controversy.

The noble Lord and his friends say that this denominational religious teaching, given at the expense of the Church or denomination, should not be given in school hours. I think the onus of proof rests on those who say that a vast body of people in this country, whose children go to the schools and who pay the taxes or rates by which the schools are supported, should not be allowed to arrange with the local authority that their children should have this teaching in school hours if they wish it. The onus of proof will certainly rest on those who desire to fetter, in what seems to me this strange way, the right of the parent, the ratepayer, the taxpayer, and the local education authority. This question, I agree, is not likely to be settled in this Parliament, but as to-day we are exchanging mutual confidences, and as my noble friend who spoke last urged that on this side we should show that we reciprocated the spirit shown on that side, let me put, not in any spirit of contention, some of our points of view, which I think noble Lords opposite would do well to think over.

We have heard a great deal about the Nonconformist conscience. Noble Lords on that side of the House and their supporters in the country say that the Government have not sufficiently considered the conscience of Nonconformists and those who object to a system of denominational teaching. That has not been our intention, but noble Lords opposite do not seem to be aware that Church people have as deep and conscientious convictions in favour of denominational teaching as some Nonconformists have in favour of undenominational teaching, and it will be impossible to produce that national educational *concordat* which is desired, unless Church people and Roman Catholics and others who are denominationalists are given the same credit for religious strength of conviction as is properly claimed for Nonconformists. You cannot have a national settlement if you leave out half the nation. I will not attempt to dispute on statistics, but I will divide roughly the whole population into two halves—the half to whom the undenominational school is the ideal and the half to whom the denominational school is the ideal. It is quite impossible for us to attempt a settlement, and leave out of count that half who are undenominationalists, and it is at least as impossible for noble Lords opposite to attempt a settlement if they leave out of count that half of the nation which fervently believes in denominational religious instruction.

However imperfect the present system, the endeavour of the Government in their legislation has been to find room for both systems. Noble Lords may contend that the Government failed, that we did not sufficiently take into account the views of our Nonconformist fellow-subjects; but will they right that wrong, if wrong it be, by taking away from the other half of the population the right to denominational teaching? No, my Lords, the only national system, the only peace, the only *concordat* would be one which was accepted by Churchmen, by Roman Catholics, and by all lovers of definite religious teaching, as well as by that great Nonconformist body who prefer in the public elementary schools to have only undenominational teaching. Hitherto these bodies, although having a different interpretation of their religious ideal, have been united in wishing the system of public education in this country to be associated with religion. Pity it is that they should, by their divisions, misunderstandings, and mutual attacks, give so much hope and encouragement to those who do not wish religion to be included in the public educational system of this country. The real danger that confronts us is indifferentism to all religious teaching. It is because I hope, from what has taken place to-day, that the two sides are beginning to understand each other better, and will so be enabled to present a more united front to those who desire a system of secular instruction—it is because I believe we have advanced a little in that direction that I join in supporting the Second Reading of this Bill.

On Question, Bill read 2^a, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes past Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 4th July, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—Bridlington Corporation Bill [Lords]; Bristol Tramways (Extensions) Bill [Lords]; Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).

Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz.: — Lord Tredegar's Supplemental Estate Bill [Lords]; Scarisbrick Estate (Amendment) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.:—Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time To-morrow.

Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill; Brymbo Water Bill; Great Central and Midland Joint Railways Bill; Humber Commercial Railway and Dock Bill; Southend-on-Sea Gas Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Mersey Docks and Harbour Board Bill [Lords]. As amended, to be considered To-morrow.

Rotherham Corporation Bill. As amended, considered. Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill according read the third time, and passed.

Southport and Lytham Tramroad (Extension of Time) Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Clyde Valley Electrical Power Bill [Lords] (by Order). As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Selby Urban District Council Bill (by Order). As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

Melrose District Water Order Confirmation Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

Education Board Provisional Order (Birmingham) Bill [Lords]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

Canal Rates and Charges (Regent's Canal) Order Confirmation Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill. Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered tomorrow, and to be printed. [Bill 251.]

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP L).

Mr. AGG-GARDNER reported from the Committee on Group L of Private Bills; That the parties opposing the Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill [Newcastle-upon-Tyne Order] had stated that the evidence of Henry Francis Berry, Byker Street, Walker; Thomas Messer Sturgess, 5 Nicholas Buildings, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Dr. Robert Pittills Dawson, Walbeck Road West, Walker, was essential to their case; and, it having been proved that their attendance could not be procured without the intervention of the House, he had been instructed to move that the said H. F. Berry, T. M. Sturgess, and R. P. Dawson do attend the said Committee To-morrow, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Ordered, That Henry Francis Berry, Thomas Messer Sturgess, and Robert Pittills Dawson do attend the Committee on Group L of Private Bills To-morrow, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP L).

Mr. AGG-GARDNER reported from the Committee on Group L of Private Bills; That the parties opposing the Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill [Newcastle-upon-Tyne Order] had stated that the evidence of Thomas Carr, Engineer, Willow Terrace, Walker; James Tait, Foreman Carpenter, 114, Welbeck Road, Walker, and Alexander M'Bay, Foreman Rivetter, 11, Welbeck Road, Walker, was essential to their case; and, it having been proved that their attendance could not be procured without the intervention of the House, he had been instructed to move that the said Thomas Carr, James Tait, and Alexander M'Bay do attend the said Committee To-morrow, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Ordered, That Thomas Carr, James Tait, and Alexander M'Bay do attend the Committee on Group L of Private Bills To-morrow, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Motherwell and Bellshill Railway (Abandonment) Order Confirmation Bill; North British Railway (General Powers) Order Confirmation Bill; Paisley District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill; without Amendment.

That they have agreed to—Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill; Crystal Palace District Gas Bill, with an Amendment.

Wolverhampton Corporation Bill; Great Central Railway Bill; Plymouth Corporation Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to—Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power Bill [Lords]; Preston Corporation Water Bill [Lords]; Shipley Urban District Council Bill [Lords]; Leicestershire and Warwickshire Electric Power Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to consolidate enactments relating to Open Spaces." [Open Spaces Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend the Law relating to the Reserve Forces. [Reserve Forces Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Scotch Education Department, under the Education (Scotland) Act, 1878, to enable the School Board of the Burgh of Edinburgh to put in force the Lands Clauses Acts." [Scotch Education Department Provisional Order Confirmation (Edinburgh) Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade, under The Tramways Act, 1870, relating to Bishop Auckland, Shildon, and Spennymoor Tramways, Dewsbury Corporation Tramways, East Ham Urban District Council Tramways, Ossett Corporation Tramways, Sunderland Corporation Tramway, and West Ham Corporation Tramways." [Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Wishaw Corporation." [Wishaw Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Airdrie Corporation Gas." [Airdrie Corporation Gas Order Confirmation Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to the Burgh of Govan." Govan Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to the Caledonian Railway." [Caledonian Railway Order Confirmation Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled "An Act to confirm a Provisional Order, under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to the Glasgow and South Western Railway." [Glasgow and South Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to enlarge the powers of Investment of the Trustees of Sir Humphrey Francis de Trafford's Settled Estates so as to enable them to purchase his Life Interest in the Settled Estates, and for vesting Life interest in such Trustees; and for other purposes." [De Trafford Estate Bill [Lords.]

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to authorise the Urban District Council of Ilford, in the county of Essex, to carry out street improvements; to make further provision for the improvement, health, local government, and finance of the district; and for other purposes." [Ilford Urban District Council Bill [Lords.]

Scotch Education Department Provisional Order Confirmation (Edinburgh) Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 252.]

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 253.]

Wishaw Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [Lords]. To be considered upon Wednesday.

Airdrie Corporation Gas Order Confirmation Bill [Lords]. To be considered upon Wednesday.

Govan Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 12th July, and to be printed. [Bill 254.]

Caledonian Railway Order Confirmation Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 12th July, and to be printed. [Bill 255.]

Glasgow and South Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 12th July, and to be printed. [Bill 256.]

De Trafford Estate Bill [Lords]; Ilford Urban District Council Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; from Acaster Malbis; Addlestone; Alnmouth; Althorpe; Ashbourne; Ashton under Lyne; Ashwater; Aughton; Aylsham; Barnsley; Bassalleg; Bawdeswell; Belton; Bishop Auckland; Bishop Monkton; Bishop's Nympton; Blackfordby; Boroughbridge; Borth; Briston; Bromley; Carlisle; Castleton (two); Chertsey; Church Gresley; Colby; Corringham; Cromer; Denbigh Head; Dogmaels; Drinkstone; East Dulwich; Edmonton; Enfield; Forest Hill; Glaisdale End; Grafton cum Marton; Gregilt; Gunthorpe; Gunwalloe; Hampsthwaite; Hartlepool (two); Hartshorne; Haverfordwest; Haxey; Hickling; Higham Ferrers; Hull (two); Killinghall; Kingston upon Hull; Leicester; Levenshulme; Llangwn; Loughton; Luddington; Lytham (two); Manor Park; Marloes; Masbro'; Merlin's Bridge; Merthyr; Milford Haven; Minskip, Staveley, and Aldborough; Mundesley; Newton Longville; North Walsham; Norwich; Norwich, North Walsham, and Cromer (five); Overstrand; Owston; Plymouth; Ponsanooth; Reepham; Rhondda Fawr; Ripon (two); Roch; Rochdale; Salhouse; Seven Kings; Sheffield; South Repps; South Wales; Swallow Nest; Swadlincote; Swanton; Tostoch; Tottenham; Treeton; Walton on Thames; Whitland; Willesden Green; Wishaw; Wolverhampton (two); Wombourne; Woodville; and Wroot; to lie upon the Table.

VALUATION BILL.

Petition from Glendale, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS.

Copy presented, of Report of the Chief Inspector for 1903, Part I., Reports [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SOUTH AFRICA.

Copy presented, of Census Returns of British South Africa [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRANSVAAL AND ORANGE RIVER COLONY.

Copy presented, of Correspondence relating to Affairs in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Copy presented, of Return showing the population, valuation, the average assessment levied under The Education (Scotland) Act, 1872, for the three years 1900–1901 to 1902–3 in each parish, and the total raised from each local government district, together with calculations showing the amount which would be raised from each parish if the total assessment so raised from each local government district were imposed as a district rate upon parishes on the basis of (1) valuation alone, and (2) half on valuation and half on population [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC WORKS LOAN BOARD.

Copy presented, of Twenty-ninth Annual Report (for 1903–4), with Appendices [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 238.]

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Rule made by the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland appointing the places at which Examinations shall be held for 1904 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Rule made by the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland determining the number of Centre Superintendents to be appointed for the Examinations, 1904 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

CAPE OF GOOD HOPE OBSERVATORY.

Copy presented, of Report of the Astronomer to the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty for the year 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series No. 3201 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 5) BILL.

Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill."—(*Mr. Bonar Law.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Postal Facilities in County Kerry.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he will arrange for daily delivery of letters in the townlands of Readrinagh, Knockdoorah, Meentogues, Stagmount, Gortnaglah, and Connearagh, between Headfort and Rathmore, county Kerry, seeing that the district is thickly populated and includes two schools.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) Inquiry is being made on the subject. When it is completed I will acquaint the hon. Member with the result.

Carriage of Parcels from Tynan (County Armagh) to Glasgow.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the Great Northern Railway Company (Ireland) decline to forward parcels leaving Tynan, county Armagh, at 6.18 p.m., to Glasgow by the Ardrossan boat leaving Belfast at 9.30, unless advised by telegram of their despatch and the payment of one shilling extra; and if he can take any steps to protect the traders of the county from this charge.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) The Board of Trade have communicated with the Great Northern Railway of Ireland on the subject of the Question, and I have directed that a copy of the reply received from the company shall be forwarded to the hon. Member.

Steamer "Allanton" confiscated by Russians at Vladivostock.

COLONEL DENNY (Kilmarnock Burghs): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he proposes to take any action in the case of the steamer "Allanton," confiscated by Russian authorities at Vladivostock.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) His Majesty's Government are in communication on the subject with His Majesty's Ambassador at St. Petersburg, who has asked to be supplied with an official statement of the grounds of condemnation. They understand that the owner of the vessel has taken steps to lodge an appeal, for which a month's time is allowed, to the Supreme Prize Court, which will sit at St. Petersburg, and in these circumstances His Majesty's Government must await the decision of that tribunal before deciding what, if any, representation they can properly address to the Russian Government when the full facts of the case are before them.

Observance of Sunday in the Royal Navy.

SIR MARK STEWART (Kirkcudbrightshire): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether orders were given to the Mediterranean Fleet, or part of it, to proceed to sea on Sunday the 5th June, to carry out a torpedo attack that day; and, if so, whether the Lords of the Admiralty will give directions to all Admirals in Command for the due observance of the King's Regulations, that a ship's company is not to be employed on Sundays in any work or duty other than that which the public service may absolutely require.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) Certain vessels of the Mediterranean Fleet, acting under the orders of the Rear Admiral Commanding the Mediterranean Cruisers, left Gibraltar at 6 p.m. on Sunday 5th June, with a view to carrying out certain strategical exercises during the night, and the morning of 6th June. It is not known whether any special reason existed for this date having been selected, but attention will be called to the desirability of a close adherence to the provisions of Article 667 of the King's Regulations and Admiralty Instructions, whenever the conditions of the service admit of it.

Refusal to Sanction Loan for Purchase of Land for Allotments at Gosberton.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): To ask the President of the Local Government Board, whether he will state the grounds upon which the Local Government Board have refused their sanction to the parish council of Gosberton obtaining a loan to defray the cost of buying lands for allotments.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) Parish councils are not empowered to purchase land for allotments, although they can hire it. I had, therefore, no alternative but to decline to sanction the loan desired by the Gosberton Parish Council, but I suggested that the matter might be brought before the rural district council, by whom land can be purchased for allotment purposes.

Accidents with Covered Vans—Infringement of new By-law.

SIR THOMAS DEWAR (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will state how the number of accidents with covered vans for the month of May last compares with the corresponding month last year; and will he say how many summonses have been taken out by the police for infringement of the London County Council new by-law.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) The number of accidents with covered vans known to the police to have occurred within the Metropolitan police district during the month of May last was 101, of which three had fatal results. In the previous May the number was 118, one being fatal. The London County Council are proposing to amend the by-law relating to covered vans, and have submitted a new draft which I have approved provisionally. In the meantime, the police, though warning owners and drivers in cases where the by-law is not being complied with, are not seeking to enforce it by means of legal proceedings.

Value of Licensed Premises.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department what is the average annual value of the 1869 beer licensed houses; also, whether he will state the number of fully on-licensed houses other than the 1869 beerhouses whose average annual value is below £50.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) I have no means of distinguishing the "ante-'69" beerhouses from other beerhouses, and am unable, therefore, to give the average annual value of the former. The number of fully on-licensed houses of an annual value of less than £50 appears, from Papers which I have laid before Parliament in connection with the Bill, to be 34,535.

Assessment of Income-Tax on Contributions to the British Cotton Growing Association.

MR. EMMOTT (Oldham): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether his attention has been called to the fact that income-tax is charged on contributions made by firms in the cotton trade to the British Cotton Growing Association; whether, seeing that such contributions are wholly and exclusively laid out or expended for the purposes of such trade, he will give instructions that such contributions shall not in future be assessed for income-tax.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) I find on inquiry that the Board of Inland Revenue have no knowledge of the assessments referred to in the Question. If such assessments have been made, their legality could only be definitely decided by an appeal to the High Court from the district Commissioners of Taxes; but it may be convenient that I should point out that, in the analogous case of contributions by a colliery company to a coalowners' association, the Courts have held that the subscription is not money laid out for the purposes of trade, and is not therefore admissible as a deduction from the profits of the company for purposes of assessment to income-tax (vide Rhymney Iron Company, Limited, *v.* Fowler, 2 Q. B. 79 (1896). I have, in any case, no authority to give such instructions as the hon. Member suggests, and no power to enforce them.

Epidemic at Ballynaclosha—National School Teacher's Salary.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the special circumstances of Mr. Lavelle, Ballynaclosha National School, Armagh; and whether, seeing that his salary for the years 1898 and 1899 was, owing to epidemic, far below what it was before, special consideration will be given to his case by substituting other years for those in which the epidemic occurred.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The average income for the three years ended 31st March, 1900, was taken as the basis in fixing the consolidated salaries of all teachers, and the substitution in the calculation of any year previous to 1898 was not permissible. Cases, however, in which the rule as to the average income for the three years ended 31st March, 1900, was found to work inequitably, received special consideration. Mr. Lavelle's case was most carefully investigated in connection with a special report from the senior inspector of the circuit, but the circumstances did not warrant a departure from the general rules applicable to all teachers.

Sales on the King Harman (Kenagh) Estate.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland how many of the sales of houses on the King Harman (Kenagh) Estate in the village of Kenagh have been sanctioned by the Estates Commisioners; whether any effort is being made to see that these bargains are not of such a character as will be of little use to the tenants for reduction purposes in the future; and will an nspection be made in these cases.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) No advances have yet been sanctioned. Applications for advances in respect of village plots have been received. These plots have been inspected, and any advances that may be made will be of such amounts as in the opinion of the Commissioners are adequately secured.

Peat Factory Experiments in Ireland.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state what success has attended the effort to establish a peat factory at Inny Junction, county Westmeath; and will the experiment be extended to other centres.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The peat experiments at Inny Junction have not been in progress for a sufficient length of time to enable the Department to state whether they are likely to prove a success. It would be premature to consider the question of the extension of the experiment to other parts of Ireland until adequate information is available in regard to the result of the experiment now in progress.

Gas from Peat.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state if the attention of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction in Ireland has been called to the success of the experiments of peat produced gas at Dumfries and also at Northampton; and whether, as there are large quantities of unproductive bog in Ireland in which this fuel could be obtained, the attention of the Department will be directed to the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) An officer of the Department visited the peat works at Dumfries last year, but did not learn that the production of gas had been a success. The Department has no knowledge of the result of the experiment at Northampton, but will make inquiries on the subject.

Condition of Fishing Industry on the South East Coast of Ireland.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is in a position to state the result of his inquiries into the condition of the fishing industry on the south east coast of Ireland, and what he proposes to do for the assistance of that industry.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) If the hon. Baronet will repeat the Question on Monday next I hope to be then in a position to make a statement in the matter.

Salaries of Irish School Teachers.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the principal teacher of a boys' school in county Down, Circuit 9, Section C, District 19, Roll No. 1950, is trained and in the first division of second class; that he has been granted his training diploma; that the average for the last quarter was sixty; that he has been three years in the service of the National Board; that he got the reports fair, fair, and good; that increments have been awarded on similar reports; that under the old system with his present average of fifty-five he would have a salary (exclusive of capitation) of £82 16s., consisting of class salary £52 16s., and results fees £30; and that his present salary is £56; and, if so, whether, in view of the fact that he entered a training college before the introduction of the new system, the Commissioners will increase his present salary to what it would have been under the old system.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The principal teacher of the school in question entered the service of the Board for the first time on 23rd July, 1900, and accordingly came under the rules then in force. He has no claim for special consideration under the rules in force prior to that date. Under Rule 194 (c) he ranks as in third grade only. He is paid salary according to the scale laid down for that grade, viz., £56 per annum. The teacher was trained during the session 1898–1900, but the privileges embodied in Rule 200 III. refer to persons who were trained during the session 1899–1900 and were recognised as teachers before entering the college. His claim to an increment of continued good service salary will be considered this year.

Burial Ground at Leixlip.

MR. LEAMY (Kildare, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if additional burial grounds are needed in Leixlip; and if land can be acquired there either to increase existing burial grounds or for new ones.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) No representations have been made to the Local Government Board on the subject, and it is not aware that there is need for additional burial ground accommodation at Leixlip. The matter is one for the consideration of the local authority in the first instance.

Irish Evicted Tenants—Application of Mr. George Ward for Reinstatement.

MR. HUGH LAW (Donegal, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have received an application from Mr. George Ward, Tuberkeen, Dungloe, county Donegal, for re-instatement in the farm from which he was evicted; whether the estate upon which his former holding is situated is in the Land Judge's Court, or has been offered for sale to the Estates Commissioners or to the Congested Districts Board; and whether, in event of a sale of the estate, the reinstatement of Ward will be favourably considered.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) An application for reinstatement has been received from G. Ward, and will be considered. The Estates Commissioners have received no application in respect of the sale of the estate. It was offered to the Congested Districts Board, but the Board decided not to purchase it. The estate does not appear to be in the Land Judge's Court.

Valuation of Mr. O'Donnell's Lands at Annascaul.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Commissioners of Valuation made a mistake in increasing the valuation of the lands of Mr. M. O'Donnell, Annascaul, county Kerry, by £5, while they decreased the valuation of his neighbour by a similar amount, and that Mr. O'Donnell was thus compelled to pay in rates £1 13s. 9d. through the mistake of a Government Department; and, if so, whether steps will be immediately taken to have this sum refunded to him.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) There is no occupier of land named M. O'Donnell entered in the valuation lists for the townland in which the village of Annascaul is situated. Possibly the holding entered in the lists as occupied by Thomas O'Donnell, in the townland of Dromavally, is referred to. It was part of a large Rundale holding which was divided in 1900 and 1903. The valuations allotted to the various holders in these years were not appealed against, either by him or by any of the other occupiers. A further division and applotment was asked for and made in 1904, the effect of which was to reduce the valuation of O'Donnell's farm, which consists of eight separate lots, by £5. If O'Donnell objected to the former applotment he should have availed himself of his statutory right of appeal to the Commissioner of Valuation and the Court of quarter sessions. There is no power now to re-open the case as suggested.

Colours of Militia Regiments that served in South Africa.

MR. EMMOTT: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, seeing that Militia regiments which have served abroad during wars previous to the South African War have had the name of the country in which they served added to their colours, it has yet been decided to allow Militia regiments which served in the South African War to add South Africa to their colours.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) I am not at present in a position to give the hon. Member a reply to his Question, but I hope to be able to do so shortly.

Malta Government Balance-Sheet.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether in the estimate that the Maltese Government had also to its credit on the 29th of February last the net surplus brought forward from the year 1902–3, viz.: £19,416, the item of £22,939 19s. 10¾d., which is set out in the debtor side of the Treasury Account, is referred to; whether, in the statement of expenditure for the period at £363,279, the ordinary and special advances and waterworks department stores, which together amount to £18,852, are included; and whether he will supply a copy of the balance-sheet issued on 29th February and of the statements which accompanied it.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) The net surplus of revenue over expenditure for the year 1902–3, viz.: £19,416, is included in the item of £22,939 to which the hon. Member refers. Consequently, if the Colonial Government had had to sell all its investments in Imperial and Colonial Funds on the 29th February the surplus after meeting its liabilities in respect of depreciation would have been £12,780, *i.e.* the difference between the excess of revenue over expenditure for the period to the 29th February, viz.: £48,385, and the net deficit on the investments, *i.e.* £35,605, and I desire to correct my reply of the 28th June to this extent. The ordinary and special advances and waterworks department stores are not included in the expenditure account of £363,279 to which the hon. Member refers. A copy of the Gazette containing a copy of the balance-sheet as on the 29th February and of the statements which accompanied it, is enclosed.

Census of the Transvaal.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can now give a summary of the recent census in the Transvaal showing the following particulars:—number of each sex above the age of sixteen of Dutch and English race in Pretoria, Johannesburg, and the district outside respectively; the like figures of those under sixteen; and the total figures of natives of each sex above sixteen in Pretoria, Johannesburg, and the district outside respectively.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) The census figures will be published to Parliament this week. They do not distinguish persons of Dutch and English race, but only differentiate between European or white and natives and other coloured persons. This is the practice which has been followed elsewhere in South Africa in taking the census.

The Transvaal Legislative Council.

MR. JOHN ELLIS: To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will give the names of the members of the Transvaal Legislative Council, mentioning the official positions occupied by some of them and the professions or avocations of the others, distinguishing those nominated by the High Commissioner from those elected, stating by whom they are elected and also when the life of the present Council expires.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) The annexed list shows the composition of the Legislative Council of the Transvaal so far as my information goes. I do not know the avocations of five members who were appointed as representing the various sections of the Boer population. Nor do I know the avocation of Mr. Raitt, who was appointed to represent the working classes. I believe that there are now three vacancies caused by the transfer of members who held office. The seven first-named members are so by virtue of their office. The others are appointed individually by the Crown, and in nearly every case their appointments expire in May, 1905. There are no elected members.

List of Members composing the Legislative Council.

Name.	Official Position or Avocation.
The Hon. Sir Arthur Lawley, K.C.M.G.	Lieutenant Governor.
Sir Richard Solomon, K.C.M.G.	Attorney-General.
Patrick Duncan	Colonial Secretary.
Sir Godfrey Yeatman Lagden, K.C.M.G.	Commissioner for Native Affairs.
W. L. Hitchens	Colonial Treasurer.
Horace Weldon	Acting Commissioner of Mines.
A. Jameson	Commissioner of Lands.
J. F. Brown	Postmaster-General.
Dr. G. Turner	Medical Officer of Health for Transvaal.
J. W. Honey	Director of Customs.
Lieut.-Col. H. M. Jackson, R.E.	Surveyor-General.
F. B. Smith	Director of Agriculture.
Fabian Ware	Director of Education.
E. F. Bourke	Merchant.
J. C. Brink	
A. P. J. Cronje	
J. Z. de Villiers	
T. Everard	Farmer.
Sir G. Farrar, Kt., D.S.O.	Mining Director.
Sir J. P. Fitzpatrick, Kt.	Mining Director.
W. Hosken	Merchant.
H. C. Hull	Solicitor.
R. K. Loveday	Landowner.
A. S. Rait.	
P. Roux.	
H. Solomon	Stockbroker.
H. P. F. Janse van Rensburg	

Resignation of Sir Charles Eliot—Suggested Committee of Inquiry.

Mr. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury if the Government intend to appoint a Committee or Commission to investigate the causes of Sir Charles Eliot's resignation in East Africa.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) There seems no reason to adopt the exceptional method proposed. The hon. Member will soon have the Papers in his hands, when I think he will come to the same conclusion.

Native Labour in the Transvaal Mines.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can state the number of coloured persons employed on the last day of March, April, and May of this year in the Transvaal gold mines, calculated on the same basis as the Return given by him on 26th May last, distinguishing between those in employ and at work.

†(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*)

Transvaal Gold Mines.

	Coloured persons on last day of each month. In employ.	At work.
	—	—
March, 1904	79,569	73,667
April ,,	78,825	73,246
May ,,	(Official Return of Mines Department with these figures not yet received).	

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Flogging in the Navy.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he will explain why, although the cat, as an instrument of flogging, has been abolished in the Army, it has only been suspended in the Navy by an order of the Admiralty; will he state why the British seaman is still subject to flogging in naval prisons; and whether, on land or sea, cats are part of the equipment of the naval prisons; and, seeing that the statutory rules and orders as to discipline in naval prisons authorises the infliction of thirty-six lashes or strokes with the cat or birch in the case of a prisoner over eighteen years of age; he will say whether any steps will be taken for the abolition of this punishment in the Royal Navy.

The SECRETARY to the ADMIRALTY (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge): Flogging with cat o' nine tails was suspended by an order of the Board of Admiralty in 1881. When the Naval Discipline Act was amended in 1884, the power of awarding this punishment was not abolished but remained merely suspended. There has been no amendment of the Naval Discipline Act since then and it is not likely that legislation would be obtained for this reason only. The rules governing the award of this punishment in the Naval Prison Regulations are practically identical with those contained in the statutory rules and orders for local prisons. The answer to the third part of the Question is "Yes." The fourth part is not understood. There is no intention so far as I am aware of abolishing corporal punishment in the naval prisons.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: Then I take it that the cat is part of the necessary equipment of ships of war and training ships.

Mr. PRETYMAN: That was not the Question addressed to me.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: Is it part of the equipment of naval prisons ashore and afloat?

Mr. PRETYMAN: There are no naval prisons afloat

Mr. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Seeing that the cat has been abolished in the Army why retain it for the Navy?

[No Answer was returned.]

Volunteers in Camp.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if there is a record that in a brigade of Volunteers encamped in 1900 on Salisbury Plain 90 per cent. went home in consequence of three days' rain; and, if so, will he state the name of the brigadier, and what regiments constituted the brigade, and who were their respective commanding officers and adjutants, and further by what means, being then under military law, such Volunteers were able to leave the camp.

The SECRETARY of STATE for WAR (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.): I can find no trace in any official record of any such incident as that referred to in the Question. If it occurred it is not creditable to the brigade concerned. I may perhaps add that unwillingness to face hardship or to incur discomfort is certainly not characteristic of the Volunteer Force—a fact to which I can bear personal testimony, and which I believe all those who have been officially connected with the training of Volunteers will readily confirm.

Chinese Labour in the Transvaal —Recruitment at Canton.

Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland): I beg to ask the

---

† To be substituted for Answer previously printed and circulated.

Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, seeing that Article V. of the recent Anglo-Chinese Convention requires that indentured emigrants from China shall be embarked only at a treaty port, the embarkation at Hong-kong of coolies on the steamship "Tweeddale" was a contravention of this treaty; whether the Chinese Viceroy at Canton has forbidden the recruitment of any more coolies for the Transvaal; and, if so, whether his action was taken as a protest against the infraction of the treaty.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. LYTTELTON, Warwick and Leamington): The Anglo-Chinese Convention does not apply to Hong-kong, which is not a treaty port, and there has been no contravention of the treaty. It is true that about two months ago the Viceroy of Canton issued a proclamation declaring recruiting for South Africa in that district illegal. His Majesty's Minister at Peking has made representations to the foreign board, and they have requested the Viceroy to withdraw the prohibition.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: Was the prohibition due to the fact that the Chinese authorities considered there had been a contravention of the Treaty?

[No Answer was returned.]

Number of Chinese already in South Africa.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can now state the total number of men, the total number women, and the total number of children of Chinese extraction who have arrived in South Africa under the Transvaal Labour Ordinance; and, if not, whether he will telegraph to Lord Milner for these facts by cable.

MR. LYTTELTON: I informed the hon. Member for the Cleveland Division on the 7th of last month† that none of the emigrants who have come from Hong-kong had taken their families with them. The number of men is just over 1,000, according to the newspaper telegrams. I do not think it necessary to telegraph to Lord Milner on the subject.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: Did any women or children accompany the second batch of coolies?

MR. LYTTELTON asked for notice of the Question.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): May I ask whether these particular coolies were recruited under the early advertisement, in which no mention was made of the fact that they might take their wives and children.

MR. LYTTELTON: My information is that they were fully informed before embarkation that they had a right to take their families with them.

DR. MACNAMARA: Then can the right hon. Gentleman give any reason why no women and children did accompany them?

[No Answer was returned.]

Treatment of Chinese Coolies at Durban.

MAJOR SEELY (Isle of Wight): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can now state by whose authority, and under what legal sanction, the Chinese labourers recently landed at Durban in Natal were confined in compounds, and locked in railway carriages, guarded by special police; by whose orders the police were detailed for this duty; and at whose charge they were maintained on this special duty?

MR. LYTTELTON; I am informed by the Acting-Governor of Natal that the Chinese were not placed in guarded compounds; they were conveyed straight from the ship to the train which took them to the Transvaal. I am to receive a report on the circumstances of the landing and despatch of these labourers by mail.

MAJOR SEELY: I have already twice asked this Question and obtained no Answer. I want to know under what Act, by what sanction of law, this confinement was done, and I respectfully press for an Answer.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxv., 923.

MR. LYTTELTON: I have already answered that there was not a confinement.

MAJOR SEELY: There is no doubt that there was a confinement.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! It is not in order to debate the Question.

MAJOR SEELY: Will the right hon. Gentleman state whether the labourers were locked in carriages, which is a deprivation of liberty?

*MR. SPEAKER: I understand that the right hon. Gentleman has already answered the Question "whether he can now state by whose authority and under what legal sanction the Chinese labourers recently landed at Durban in Natal were confined in compounds."

SEVERAL OPPOSITION MEMBERS: And locked in railway carriages.

MR. LYTTELTON: I have already said there was no confinement in compounds. I have no information with regard to the carriages; but, as I have stated on more than one occasion, I am to receive a report on the subject.

MAJOR SEELY: Should not the information on a matter of this importance be communicated to the House by cable?

MR. LYTTELTON: I have not the slightest reason to believe that the Natal Government have done anything contrary to the law. I do not propose to satisfy myself, except in the manner I have already indicated.

Terms of the Chinese Labour Contract.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the form of contract signed by the Chinese labourers before importation to the Transvaal contains any reference to their right to the transport of their wives and children to that country, to the obligation to work for ten hours *per diem* underground, and to their obligation to be confined in a compound during their term of servitude; whether a copy of the form of contract is in the possession of the Colonial Service; if so, whether he will lay it upon the Table of the House; and, if not, whether he will at once telegraph to the Governor of Hong-kong to transmit by cable the form of contract, and lay it upon the Table of the House on its receipt.

MR. LYTTELTON: The form of the contract signed by the Chinese labourers was, I understand, that printed at pages 28-32 of Cd. 2026.

No Close Time for Chinese Coolies.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether there is any close time for the admission of Chinese labourers into the Transvaal; and whether any limit is to be placed upon the number to be admitted.

MR. LYTTELTON: No close time has been fixed by the Government nor has any limit at present been placed on the number to be admitted.

Embarkation of Coolies at Hong-kong.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Chinese labourers, who were embarked for South Africa at the British port of Hong-kong, are excluded from the purview of the recent Anglo-Chinese Convention, and from the protection it would afford, for the reason that the Convention applies only to labourers embarked at Chinese treaty ports.

MR. LYTTELTON: The Convention cannot of course apply to Hong-kong which is not a treaty port but a British Colony. Labourers leaving Hong-kong are protected not by the treaty but by the Colonial law and administration.

Debarkation of Coolies from the "Tweeddale."

DR. MACNAMARA: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been called to the fact that when the ss "Tweeddale" arrived in Durban Harbour on Saturday, 18th June, a floating cordon of pontoons containing police with loaded rifles surrounded her, police with loaded rifles paraded her decks and the wharves, the coolies were photographed and registered under armed supervision, and entrained for Johannesburg under armed military escort; and whether he will ask Lord Milner for a report on these proceedings by cable.

Mr. LYTTELTON: I am expecting to receive by mail a report on the circumstances of the arrival of these coolies, and I do not propose to telegraph.

Dr. MACNAMARA: Will the right hon. Gentleman lay the despatch when received?

[The Answer was inaudible.]

Natal Act (Immigration) 1903—Alleged Infraction by the "Tweeddale."

Major SEELY: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that by the provisions of the Natal Act, Immigration (restricted), 1903, the master and owners of any vessel, from which any person suffering from a loathsome or a dangerous contagious disease may be landed, are liable to a penalty of from £100 to £5,000; whether the master or owners of the British ship "Tweeddale," from which immigrants suffering from beri-beri were landed at Durban, have been subjected to the penalties referred to; and whether he will take steps to warn the masters and owners of British ships of the penalties to which they are liable for any infringement of the provisions of the above Act while engaging in this traffic.

Mr. LYTTELTON: I have telegraphed for information to the Officer Administering the Government of Natal and have received the following answer:—"My Ministers suggest that you give following reply to Question. Begins—'It is the custom in Natal to subject persons to penalties after they have broken the law, not before. The "Tweeddale" did not infringe the Immigration Restriction Act. No British ships are liable to penalties for engaging in this traffic—namely, the conveyance of Chinese immigrants under a scheme approved by the Government of Natal. Both shipmasters and Transvaal Government have been duly informed of our law and of the requirements thereunder.'" It will be observed that the Natal authorities do not consider beri-beri to be a loathsome or dangerous contagious disease.

Major SEELY: The Answer, though somewhat discourteous, does not cover the Question whether in point of fact such persons were landed, and, if so, whether the penalties were inflicted.

Mr. LYTTELTON: The hon. Member is aware that the Natal Government have, as a self-governing colony, Ministers who are the judges on this point—subject to the hon. Member. The Natal Ministers say that there has not been an infraction of the Natal law. [Opposition cries of "Why?"] I presume the reason must be that they are satisfied that beri-beri is not a contagious disease.

Major SEELY: With great respect may I point out that it is not denied that it is a loathsome disease?

*Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. Member is not satisfied he must put down a more specific Question. The Answer given to the Question on the Paper is that, according to the right hon. Gentleman's knowledge and information, no breach of the law has been committed in Natal.

Beri-beri on the "Tweeddale."

Sir WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in view of the fact that forty-three cases of beri-beri developed on board the "Tweeddale" during the voyage from China to Durban, that she was sent back to China with the surviving cases, thirty-five in number, and that beri-beri is a malady which infects a ship or place in which cases of the disease are collected, he will take steps to have this ship discharged from the service of bringing Chinese coolies to South Africa.

Mr. LYTTELTON: I have no reason to doubt that the Transvaal emigration agent at the port of embarkment will take any steps which are necessary in the matter. He has full power to obtain medical advice for his guidance in such matters.

Telegrams to Lord Milner.

Dr. MACNAMARA: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will give the number and dates of the telegrams he has addressed to Lord

Milner, asking for information respecting the outbreak of the disease beri-beri among the Chinese coolies; what were the dates of the reply or replies from Lord Milner; whether he is in a position to give any explanation of the delay in the receipt of Lord Milner's reply; and whether the text of these telegrams will be reproduced in the Blue-book about to be issued.

Mr. LYTTELTON: The telegrams I addressed to Lord Milner were sent on the 23rd, 25th, and 27th of June, I received an answer from Lord Milner dated 28th of June, and two subsequent telegrams dated 30th June. I gave in reply to the hon. Member for the Rye Division on Thursday last † my explanation as to the delay and have nothing to add thereto. I will include the telegrams in the Blue-book to be published this week.

Chinese Exclusion Bill in Cape Colony.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the assent of the Crown to the Chinese Exclusion Bill, to which the Governor of Cape Colony reserved his assent for the consideration of the Crown, while that assent was given to all other measures passed by the Cape Parliament, has yet been given; and, if not, what is the reason for the delay in this formality.

Mr. LYTTELTON: No, Sir; the authenticated copy of the Bill referred to only reached me two days ago.

Representative Government in South Africa.

Mr. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any communications have been received from the Transvaal or the Orange River Colony respecting the grant of representative Government; and whether the subject has been considered by Ministers; if so, can any statement be made as to the date when such representative Government will be granted.

Mr. LYTTELTON: I am not in a position at present to make any statement on the subject.

Maltese Finance.

Mr. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in view of the fact that three months have elapsed since the close of the financial year in Malta, he will undertake that a copy of the balance-sheet for the year will be available for Members of the House before the Vote on the Colonial Estimates is taken.

Mr. LYTTELTON: I am communicating the hon. Member's Question to the Governor of Malta, but pending the receipt of his reply, which I am requesting him to furnish by telegraph, I am unable to state at what date the financial statements for the year ending the 31st of March last will be ready.

Mr. BOLAND: I will put a further Question next week.

The Tibetan Mission.

Mr. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if he has had information as to the request of the Tibetans for an armistice; and whether competent negotiators have been appointed to settle points of difference; and, if so, has the British Commander authority to receive and treat with such negotiators.

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford): An armistice was granted up to 30th June and has been prolonged at the request of the Tibetans. The Ta Lama, accompanied by representatives of the three Lhasa monasteries, has been received by Colonel Younghusband and is now in negotiation with him. It is not yet known whether the Ta Lama has authority to effect an agreement with Colonel Younghusband, but in this event the British Commissioner has authority to treat with him.

Mr. FLYNN (Cork County, N.): Are representatives of the Chinese Government allowed to take part in the negotiations?

Mr. BRODRICK: Representatives of the Chinese Government have been in communication with us throughout, and of course will be associated with us in the negotiations.

---

† See page 156.

Russo-Japanese War—Seizure of the "Allanton."

Mr. WOLFF (Belfast, E.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that the British steamer "Allanton," whilst proceeding from Marsran, in Japan, to Singapore with a cargo of coals consigned to a British subject, was seized by a Russian vessel and taken to Vladivostock, and has since been condemned there as a prize and confiscated; and will he state what steps His Majesty's Government propose to take in order to obtain the release of the vessel.

The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.): His Majesty's Government are aware of the fact and are in communication on the subject with His Majesty's Ambassador at St. Petersburg, who has asked to be supplied with an official statement of the grounds of condemnation. They understand that the owner of the vessel has taken steps to lodge an appeal, for which a month's time is allowed, to the Supreme Prize Court which will sit at St. Petersburg, and in these circumstances His Majesty's Government must await the decision of that tribunal before deciding what, if any, representation they can properly address to the Russian Government when the full facts of the case are before them.

Mr. WOLFF: Will the appeal be to St. Petersburg?

Earl PERCY: Yes.

Mr. WOLFF: Is nothing being done meanwhile to urge the Russian Government to release the vessel?

Mr. JOSEPH DEVLIN (Kilkenny, N.): Is there an English representative at Vladivostock from whom the owner of the vessel may obtain assistance?

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): Has an appeal been made?

Earl PERCY: The minimum time for appeal is, I think, a month; perhaps a little longer.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL: If the captain and crew are confined, how can an appeal be made? It is a very serious matter for the owners of this Belfast vessel.

International Maritime Conference at Brussels.

Mr. CHARLES McARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will state the grounds upon which His Majesty's Government has decided to decline to be officially represented at the forthcoming International Conference to be held at Brussels to promote greater uniformity in the laws of the different maritime States with respect to collision and salvage liabilities.

Earl PERCY: His Majesty's Government have, in accordance with a long established and carefully considered policy, declined to be officially represented at the Conference on the grounds that their participation might be held to bind them to accept its conclusions. They will, however, take steps to secure full information of the discussions and of the decisions arrived at by the Conference.

Mr. CHARLES McARTHUR: Does the Answer imply that a representative will be sent, but he will not have power to vote?

Earl PERCY: We shall probably instruct our Minister there to obtain a full report of the proceedings.

Circulation in England of Foreign Lottery Circulars.

Sir THOMAS DEWAR (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that circular letters associated with lottery drawings conducted by H. Langenhann & Company, Bremen, were on the 22nd June last posted at the Western Central District Office, London, to persons in the United Kingdom; and, seeing that his attention has been directed to similar circulars in connection with a lottery at Budapest will he state what action he proposes to take in the matter.

Earl PERCY: The receipt in this country of lottery circulars from the firm in question was recently brought to the notice of the Foreign Office. His Majesty's Ambassador at Berlin, who was consulted on the subject, was of opinion that, as the Prussian Diet were considering the adoption of measures to check the issue of lottery circulars from the minor German States, no action on the part of His Majesty's Government was for the present desirable.

Protection of British Interests at Niuchwang.

MR. JOSEPH WALTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, in view of the reported withdrawal of the Russians from Niuchwang, the active operations of brigands in the neighbourhood, and the uncertainty as to when a Japanese occupation will take place, also that Niuchwang is not now likely to be the scene of naval operations, His Majesty's Government will send a gunboat to Niuchwang for the protection of the lives and property of British subjects.

EARL PERCY: His Majesty's Government have no reason to believe that the Russians have withdrawn from Niuchwang, but the "Espiègle" has been ordered to that port.

Licensing Bill — Value of Licensed Premises Affected.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will state approximately the value of the licensed premises to which the Bill before the House applies; the maximum capitalised amount that could be raised by quarter sessions for the purpose of closing specified licensed premises; the approximate extra value that would be given to the licensed premises remaining by the decreased competition and by the absolute fixity of tenure secured for a long period.

*THE SECRETARY of STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): I am afraid I am no more able now than I was a few days ago†, when the hon. Member asked me the same Question, to give him any such figures as he desires.

Amendment of Workmen's Compensation Act.

SIR THOMAS DEWAR: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is yet in a position to state to what trades the provisions of the Workmen's Compensation Act will be extended.

*MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: The Report of the Departmental Committee has not yet reached me, and until I get it I cannot give the hon. Gentleman the information he desires.

North Eastern Railway—Unprotected Live Rails.

MR. RENWICK (Newcastle-on-Tyne): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the fact that another death was caused by the unprotected electric live rail on the North Eastern Railway at St. Peters, Newcastle-on-Tyne, on Wednesday last; and will he inform the House what steps are being taken by the Board of Trade to compel railway companies owning electric railways to take such steps as are necessary to avoid further loss of life.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The accident referred to, which caused death of a boy who had trespassed on the line, has been reported to the Board of Trade by the railway company. Inquiries have been ordered into the circumstances attending two similar previous accidents, and this case will also be investigated. When the reports of the inspecting officers have been received the question of precautionary measures will be fully considered.

Solway Fishery Bill.

MR. CLAUDE LOWTHER (Cumberland, Eskdale): I beg to ask the hon. Member for North Huntingdonshire as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he is now in a position to state on what day this session he proposes to introduce the Solway Fishery Bill, which he has stated to be in a forward state of preparation.

---

† See page 163.

MR. AILWYN FELLOWES (Huntingdonshire, Ramsey): I am unable for the moment to specify the day upon which the Solway Fishery Bill will be introduced, but if my hon. friend will put down his Question again in a few days time I shall hope to be in a position to give a more definite answer.

MR. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.): Can the hon. Gentleman say if it is intended to introduce any other legislation this session?

[No Answer was returned.]

Rathmines Polling District Dispute.

MR. MOONEY (Dublin County, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland if his attention has been called to complaints from the Rathmines Polling District of South Dublin to the effect that the voters' requisition forms, provided for by statute and distributed by the town clerk of Rathmines (in his capacity of deputy for the clerk of the peace of Dublin County) were in many instances, and to an extent calculated to interfere with the discharge of his duty by the town clerk, taken away from the custody of those residents to whom they were issued by unauthorised persons, inaccurately filled up and returned to the said town clerk; and, if so, whether he proposes to take any, and, if so, what action to secure that these inaccuracies shall be corrected and the persons entitled, and these only, placed on the supplemental list.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): My attention has been called to the matter mentioned, which has been referred to the police for investigation.

Rathmines Commissioners' Appeal.

MR. MOONEY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been called to the delay of the Local Government Board in giving their decision on the appeal of the Rathmines Commissioners against the decision of the Dublin County Council; and when this decision may be expected.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): There has been no delay. The Inquiry was held at the end of May. The minutes of evidence, which are voluminous, were received by the Board on the 10th June. A decision will be come to as soon as possible.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Have the Local Government Board consulted the Law Officers of the Crown on this matter?

MR. WYNDHAM: I must ask for notice of that.

Irish Land Purchase—Ballydonlon Estate, County Galway.

MR. ROCHE (Galway, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the sale of the Ballydonlon Estate, county Galway the property of Mr. Mahon; whether he is aware that the tenants who held eleven months lettings on this property for a number of years past enjoyed same at an average rental of £1 1s. per acre free of taxes; and that, under the present purchase arrangements on this property, the instalment rentals per acre are increased on the tenants from £1 5s. to £1 15s. per acre, with taxes added; and, if so, whether it is proposed to pass this sale without inspection; and whether, having regard to the fact that Mr. Mahon is not selling the whole of this estate, the bonus will be granted in this case.

MR. WYNDHAM: The entire estate has been sold, but the vendor has applied for an advance to enable him to repurchase the demesne. The holdings were vested in the tenant purchasers on the 29th April. The average annuity payable per statute acre is 19s. 10d. The estate was inspected before the advances were sanctioned.

Winter Dairying in Ireland.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Department of Agriculture have taken any, and what, steps to promote winter dairying in Ireland; and what has been the result of the operations.

MR. WYNDHAM: The encouragement of winter dairying, wherever such is practicable, is part of the duty of the itinerant instructors in agriculture, of whom there are now eighteen at work. No statistics are available to show to what extent farmers have adopted the suggestions of these experts; but the subject will form part of the discussion at the Annual Conference of Itinerant Inspectors.

Mr. MURPHY: Has not a complaint been received from the Cork School that nothing has been done in this respect?

Mr. WYNDHAM: There is no mention of any complaint in the Question. As I have said, there are eighteen inspectors now on this work.

Mr. MURPHY: But they are doing nothing.

Mr. KILBRIDE: Have not the inspectors pointed out that capital is necessary to enable them to carry out the work?

Mr. WYNDHAM: I must ask for notice of that Question.

Captain DONELAN (Cork County, E.): And is it not the fact that the creamery system in Ireland is proving a discouragement to dairy farming in that country?

[No Answer was returned.]

Land Purchase in County Cavan—David Finlay's Estate.

Mr. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Irish Land Commission has been notified by tenant purchasers on the estate of David Finlay and others, near Bawnboy, in the county of Cavan, that the receivable orders which have been sent from its offices in Dublin have not been delivered to the tenants; and, if so, will he say who is responsible for their non-delivery.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I am in communication with the Land Commission in the matter, and will ask the hon. Member to postpone this and the next Question till Wednesday.

The second Question referred to was as follows—

Mr. VINCENT KENNEDY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a number of the tenants on the estate of David Finlay and others, near Bawnboy, in the county of Cavan (which is under the control of the Land Judge's Court) who have signed their purchase agreements have been notified by the Irish Land Commission that their applications to purchase their holdings have been dismissed owing to delay; if so, will he state the cause of the delay; and, if the delay does not rest with the tenants, will they still be afforded an opportunity of completing their purchase.

Tenants' Game Rights—The Clanricarde Tenants at Woodford.

Mr. ROCHE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether five of the Clanricarde tenants at Derrygoolan, Woodford, have been served with notices to quit in consequence of their asserting their right to the game on their lands.

Mr. ROCHE: I beg also to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, (1) whether he can say if the Clanricarde tenants at Derrygoolan, Woodford, are non-judicial and in possession of their holdings as tenants from year to year for many years; and (2) whether there is any agreement in writing or otherwise made by them with their landlord in respect to game; and (3) whether, in view of the circumstances of the case, he will take steps to insure that the police shall not be allowed in future to accompany poachers on the lands, seeing that such proceedings are calculated to intimidate the tenants.

Mr. WYNDHAM: Five notices to quit have been served. No cause was assigned for their issue. I understand that no judicial rents have been fixed on this property in the locality mentioned. This being so, I am unable to say whether there exist any agreements, such as referred to; nor have I at my disposal any effective means of ascertaining the fact. In the absence of any information I presume the tenants are entitled under the Ground Game Act of 1880 to kill ground game. The fact that a notice to quit has been served upon a tenant does not prevent him from selling his holding or applying to have a fair rent fixed, and should any proceedings, founded on the notices, be taken to evict him from his holding he may apply to the Court in which the proceedings have been instituted to suspend the proceedings pending the result of the fair-rent application. Should the proceedings be suspended and the application to fix a fair rent be granted, the tenant will be in the same position as if his rent had been fixed at the date of the application, and will be protected from eviction from any cause other than one of those statutory conditions for which a judicial tenant may be evicted. Should the landlord in the case be not entitled to the right he seeks to exercise, of course the tenant has his remedy at law in any action of trespass.

MR. KILBRIDE: The right hon. Gentleman has not replied to the last part of the Question—what instructions will you give to the police on the 12th August next? Are they to protect the poachers going on the lands of these tenants who, as he admits, are entitled to the game under the Act?

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: If these are yearly tenants does not that constitute them future tenants and, if so, what is the use of talking of fair rents when future tenants cannot get fair rents fixed?

MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member has put the Question correctly. They are not judicial tenants. They are tenants at will. They are precisely the same as tenants at will in this country. I cannot tell if they have any right by agreement with their landlord or not other than the right conferred under Lord Cairns' Act.

MR. ROCHE: Is the right hon. Gentleman not aware that under the law the game belongs to the tenants, and in face of that assumption—

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! If the hon. Member states any particular in which the Question has not been fully answered he is at liberty to ask, but——

MR. ROCHE: Under these circumstances, if they go on the land on the 12th August next, will he be responsible for the consequences?

MR. WYNDHAM: I have answered that. I decline, by any act upon my part, to decide a right which is not before me. If the right, as the hon. Gentleman says, is a clear one, the tenants can prosecute.

Irish Workhouse Classification.

MR. REDDY (King's County, Birr): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what is the principle on which Irish workhouses are classified; and whether he will grant a Return giving the workhouses at present included in the various classes under which they are arranged.

MR. WYNDHAM: There is no classification of workhouses. The Poor Law Commission now sitting was appointed to investigate the question of the amalgamation of workhouses, and the practicability of making better provision for the classification and treatment of the inmates. As a result of this investigation I hope it may be found possible to institute such a classification.

Enniskillen Rent Appeals.

MR. EDWARD MITCHELL (Fermanagh, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that it is a considerable time since the Land Commission sat at Enniskillen to hear appeals for fixing rents; if he will say when said Commission will next sit, in view of the number of cases awaiting their decision.

MR. WYNDHAM: The last sitting of the Appeal Court at Enniskillen was in January, 1903. The Appeal Sittings for the Michaelmas term have not yet been arranged, but when settling the circuit the Commissioners will consider whether it is practicable to arrange a further sitting at Enniskillen before the close of present year.

Bawnboy Rent Disputes.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that

Mr. A. E. Humphrys, of Lisagoan House, county of Cavan (a justice of the peace), marked judgment against seven of his tenants on an estate near Bawnboy, in the county of Cavan, that these judgments were executed by the sheriff with an escort of constables, and that these judgments were set aside; and, if so, whether he will take steps to protect these tenants from such proceedings at the hands of Mr. Humphrys in future; and if his action will be brought under the notice of the Lord Chancellor with a view of depriving him of his commission of the peace.

MR. WYNDHAM: Certain writs of execution for recovery of rent were lodged with the sheriff by Mr. Humphrys for execution against three of his tenants. The sheriff, whose duty it was to execute these, requisitioned police protection. I am not aware whether the judgments on which these writs were issued have been set aside, but, if so, the tenants will no doubt have their legal remedy. It is not the privilege of the sheriff to hold any investigation into the legality of the judgments upon which writs of execution are based. His duty is to execute the writs lodged with him which appear correct, on their face, nor is the Executive entitled to refuse protection on any such ground.

Sir Roger Palmer's Estate, County Mayo.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN: On behalf of the hon. Member for East Mayo, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the estate of Sir Roger Palmer, in county Mayo, has been offered for sale to the Estates Commissioners or to the Congested Districts Board.

MR. WYNDHAM: The estate in question has not yet been offered for sale to either the Commissioners or to the Congested Districts Board.

Enniskillen Dispensary Districts.

MR. JORDAN (Fermanagh, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been drawn to a report by Dr. M'Carthy, on the 30th May, to the Local Government Board in reference to six dispensary districts composing the union of Enniskillen, namely, that the medical officer's attendance and report books, and the medical relief register of cases and the midwife's register, were not sent to the guardians for examination, and that no arrangement has been made for the examination of the dispensary records; is he aware that the guardians, in view of the importance of such examinations, in the interest of the poor, and for the due discharge of the Medical Charities Acts by all officials concerned, on the 12th of August, 1902, requested the Local Government Board to sanction the appointment of local committees, consisting of the guardians representing the dispensary district, the clergymen of all churches, and five ratepayers in each district; the committee to meet monthly, examine the doctor's books, and report to the board of guardians; and, if so, will he, in view of the fact that the doctor's books have not been examined since the passing of the Local Government Act of 1898, and of the difficulty of inducing guardians to remain after the business of the board has terminated, take into consideration the necessity of devising some plan by which an effective examination of the doctor's books may be performed with the least tax on guardians' time.

MR. WYNDHAM: Section 30 of the Act of 1898 abolished dispensary committees and transferred their business to the board of guardians. Consequently the Local Government Board was unable to sanction the arrangement proposed in August, 1902. It is open to the guardians under Article 10 of the Dispensary Rules to appoint a small committee of its members for the purposes mentioned in the Question. In the majority of the unions the guardians themselves examine the books. Elsewhere the duty has been delegated to a committee of guardians with satisfactory results.

Congestion in South Kerry.

MR. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state how many landlords owning estates in the congested districts of South Kerry have offered their estates to the Congested Districts Board for resale to the tenants; can he state the terms demanded from the Board; and has the condition of the money market militated against the successful operation of the Land Act of 1903 in the congested districts of Ireland?

Mr. WYNDHAM: Negotiations are pending with eight landlords. Until these have been concluded no statement can be made in respect to the terms. The reply to the concluding query is in the negative.

Mr. FLAVIN: What has been the price demanded by the landlords?

Mr. WYNDHAM: It would be most improper for me to express any opinion as to the terms, either on one side or the other.

Promotion of Irish National School Teachers.

Mr. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the number of national school teachers who have received promotion whose record was "fair" for the three years ending 31st March, 1903, together with the number promoted whose record was less than "fair" for the same period.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I am informed that no teachers received promotion whose records were merely "fair" for the three years ended 31st March, 1903, and that no teachers received promotion whose records were less than "fair" for the same period.

Government Advances for Harbour Works in Ireland.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, if the Irish Government are about to advance £100,000 for harbour works in the neighbourhood of Belmullet, county Mayo; and, if so, is this sum by loan or grant, and if by loan on what terms; how much has this county received for like purposes since 1883, including the present advance; and what sums have in the same period been advanced to the county of Antrim for similar purposes.

Mr. WYNDHAM: If all the arrangements imposed by statute with the county council, railway company, and other interested parties are, as I trust may be the case, satisfactorily concluded, a sum of over £90,000 may probably be issued in respect of works in Mayo as a free grant under the Marine Works Act of 1902. That Act, in common with the Railways Act of 1896 and the Railways Act of 1890 (Mr. A. J. Balfour's Act) provides for free grants in connection only with counties of which portions are scheduled as congested. No sums under those Acts are applicable to other parts of Ireland, and no comparison can be usefully instituted between such exceptional expenditure in a 'congested' county and ordinary expenditure in an uncongested county, except for the purpose of criticising a policy consistently pursued since the year 1890. The Sea Fisheries Act of 1883 was of general application. Under it Antrim received a free grant of £1,342, and Mayo a free grant of £27,520, and a loan of £2,773. I am inquiring what are the sums granted or lent in respect of county Mayo by the Congested Districts Board under the Act of 1891, and in respect of Antrim from other sources since the year 1883.

Mr. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): As a matter of fact, has the hon. Member informed the right hon. Gentleman of the necessity for a harbour grant for this county?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order!

Irish University Education.

Mr. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of its bearing on the question of University education in Ireland, he will assent to the Return standing on to-day's Paper in the name of the hon. Member for South Down.

Mr. WYNDHAM: No, Sir; I cannot see my way to assent to the proposed Return. It would involve a departure from precedent inexpedient in itself, and ineffective for the object which the hon. Member contemplates, inasmuch as it would take no cognisance of the larger number of officials employed in the various other Departments of the State in Ireland, for which I am not answerable, and the still larger number of Irishmen holding Crown appointments outside Ireland.

MR. MACVEAGH: Is the objection to granting this Return to be found in the fact that there is a boycott of Catholics in Ireland—

[No Answer was returned.]

Appended is the Notice of Motion referred to—

Government Departments (Ireland) (Officials).—Return setting forth the names, salaries, and places of education of the salaried officials in the different Government Departments under the jurisdiction of the Chief Secretary for Ireland.

Lough Leagh Land Proprietors' Meeting.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to a meeting convened by the Board of Works, of proprietors of lands in Lough Leagh district, which was held in the county Antrim Courthouse, Belfast, on 24th June, for the purpose of appointing trustees, not exceeding fifteen in number; whether such meeting was fully advertised beforehand; whether he is aware that when a vote was taken it was found that the proprietors were outweighed by proxies; whether these proxies were obtained and used in a legal manner; and, if not, whether he will order a new election; whether, in view of the present system of administering the Trust by men who are not ratepayers and who do not reside in the flooded district, he will consider the advisability of transferring the powers and duties of the Trust to the local authorities of the several parts of the district comprising the flooded area.

MR. WYNDHAM: The meeting was convened by the Board of Works and advertised as prescribed by Section 120 of the Act 5 and 6 Vict., cap. 89. The secretary to the drainage trustees states that the proxies were in a majority. I have no reason to suppose that they were obtained or used in an illegal manner. The trustees are elected by the proprietors in the district, who are liable for payment of the rate for maintaining the drainage works. The law imposes no restriction upon the choice of trustees by the electors, and there appears to be no ground for interfering with that choice.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN: Would the right hon. Gentleman say whether this Trust is administered by those who are not ratepayers and who do not reside in the district?

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH, Derbyshire, W.): I understand the trustees are elected by the ratepayers.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN: Does the Chief Secretary intend to allow the administration of this Trust by men who have no authority or right to do so?

MR. WYNDHAM: The matter rests with my hon. friend the Secretary to the Treasury.

Complaints of Rev. R. D. Patterson of St. Barnabas Church, Dublin.

MR. SLOAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Rev. R. D. Patterson, of St. Barnabas Church, Dublin, has on several occasions complained to the police authorities that divine service in his church has been disturbed by the throwing of stones upon the roof, and that the notice board in front of the church has been damaged; and whether, in view of the fact that this clergyman when walking the public street is followed by persons calling him offensive names, he will explain why no action has been taken by the police upon these complaints.

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes, Sir. Several complaints have been made. The reply which I gave on the 22nd June† was based on reports of communications made to the police by the Rev. Mr. Patterson on the 2nd May and by his Rector, the Rev. Mr. Griffin, on the 5th May. I now find that Mr. Patterson renewed his complaints on the 10th May, and again on the 28th June. I can assure my hon. friend that the police have been instructed to protect the rev. gentleman from annoyance and that they do their best to carry out the instructions they have received.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxvi., 812.

West Coast of Ireland Fish-Curing Stations.

Mr. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Congested Districts Board make it a condition of letting their fish-curing stations on the west coast to fish buyers for the autumn season that the prices paid by buyers must be approved by the Board; if so, will he explain the necessity for it; has objection been made to this condition by any buyer on the ground that it interfered with freedom of bargaining with the fishermen; how many applications have been made for the stations at Porturlin, county Mayo; did Mr. S. G. Gott occupy one of these last year; if so, under what conditions; and have any negotiations passed between him and the Board for a sub-letting during the forthcoming autumn.

Mr. WYNDHAM: Such a condition is imposed by the Board. The object is to protect the fishermen against unfair prices being fixed by a merchant who virtually enjoys a monopoly by reason of his having acquired from the Board the only available curing station in the district. No buyer has objected to the condition on the ground stated. Two applications were received this year for the station at Porturlin. Mr. Gott signed the agreement last year; he declined to do so this season.

The McGillycuddy Estate.

Mr. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, in the case of the McGillycuddy Estate, which is now in the Land Judge's Court, and in which an order for sale has been made, a number of tenants, including Mr. Jeremiah J. Doyle, of Whitefield, have been excluded from negotiations without any satisfactory cause; and whether representations will be made to have a sale to all the tenants carried out.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I have been informed that proceedings are in progress for the sale of the entire of this estate, and that it is not the intention of the owner to exclude any tenant who may desire and agree to purchase his holding.

Mr. MURPHY: May I point out I am personally aware that this tenant has been excluded?

Insanitary Condition of Dee Street, Belfast.

Mr. JOSEPH DEVLIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that in the Dee Street of Belfast there are over 200 houses without any sanitary conveniences; and whether, in view of the outbreak of smallpox in that city, steps will be taken to induce the Corporation to more efficiently perform its duty under the Public Health Acts.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I am informed by the town clerk that there are only 106 houses in Dee Street, and that all have proper sanitary accommodation. The corporation have taken, and are taking, all necessary steps to carry out their duties under the Public Health Acts, and on Friday last adopted plans at a cost of £40,000 for the more efficient sewering of the two outlying districts recently added to the city.

Kerry Letter Deliveries.

Mr. MURPHY: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he will arrange for a daily delivery of letters in the townlands of Readrinagh, Knockdoorah, Meentogues, Stagmount, Gortnaglagh, and Connearagh, between Headfort and Rathmore county Kerry, seeing that the district is thickly populated and includes two schools.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton): Enquiry is being made on the subject. When it is completed I will acquaint the hon. Member with the result.

Belfast Post Office—Money Order Counter Funds.

Mr. SLOAN: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General, if he can explain under what circumstances did the funds at the money order counter in Belfast become exhausted on the 28th ultimo; is he aware that this has happened on several occasions; and whether, in view of the fact that the public were detained pending arrangements being made with the bank, he will give instructions for adequate arrangements for the prompt disposal of the public demands.

Lord STANLEY: I am informed that on 28th June the cash in the hands of one of the clerks at the counter was exhausted by the presentation of a Savings Bank Warrant for a considerable sum. He at once took steps to obtain a fresh supply; and no serious inconvenience seems to have been caused to the public. There does not appear to have been any other case recently in which the funds at the money order counter were exhausted.

Mr. SLOAN: But is it not the fact that this has occurred several times, though perhaps not recently?

Lord STANLEY: I am not told so.

Mr. SLOAN: It is the case.

Belfast Mails—Proposed Supplementary Service.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he will authorise a supplementary mail bag to be despatched from Belfast for London and other English towns, viâ Greenore and Holyhead, by the train leaving Belfast at 6.45 p.m., and arriving in London at 7.30 a.m., thus giving the public of Belfast more than an hour extra in which to reply to their English correspondence.

Lord STANLEY: As the hon. Member is no doubt aware there are already three dispatches in the evening from Belfast of London correspondence. It hardly appears that the expense involved for a fourth despatch would be justified. I am, however, in correspondense with the railway companies in regard to an acceleration of the Stranraer service which, if afforded, would, I hope, go far to meet the wishes of the public in Belfast. I may point out to the hon. Member that there is already a later service from Belfast (viâ Fleetwood) than the service viâ Greenore which he wishes to be used, and that letters sent viâ Fleetwood arrive in London in ample time to be answered the same afternoon.

London Delivery of Belfast Mails—Alleged Delay.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General, if he is aware that letters from Belfast for London viâ Fleetwood are not delivered in the City before 2 o'clock, although they arrive at Euston before 11; and, if so, will he take steps to have an earlier delivery.

Lord STANLEY: The mail from Belfast viâ Fleetwood is due at Euston at 10.50 a.m., too late for the City delivery, commencing at 11.20 a.m. It is accordingly included in the next delivery which begins at 12.20 p.m. and is completed about 2.0 p.m.

Great Southern and Western Railway of Ireland—Glounbawn Level Crossing.

Mr. MURPHY: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the Great Southern and Western Railway Company on their line of railway from Gortatlea to Castleisland have removed the gatesman and locked the gate leading to a passage across the line hitherto used by the people of Gurrane, Glounbawn, and Ballymacpierce; and, if so, whether he proposes to take any steps to compel the company to carry out their obligations in this matter.

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: The Board of Trade communicated with the Great Southern and Western Railway Company on the subject of the Question and learn from them that the company assumes it refers to an accommodation crossing at Glounbawn where the gates have been provided with locks, of which keys are supplied to persons entitled to use the crossing. The hon. Member's Question is not very specific as to the position of the crossing, but if the assumption that it is merely what is called an accommodation crossing is correct the company would not appear to have violated their obligations in this respect.

Mr. MURPHY: I will send the right hon. Gentleman a specific statement on the subject.

Fraudulent Balance-sheets.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the amendment of the law on the subject of fraudulent balance-sheets, promised as soon as possible during the debate on 19th February, 1903, will be introduced during the present session.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.): I should be very unwilling to add to the present programme of the Government, except in relation to Bills which are necessary for administrative reasons, unless the Bill which was added to that programme was of a genuinely uncontentious character. I suppose I may count on my hon. friend's support for the Motion before the House, which will, no doubt, add to the opportunities for Government business.

Mr, SWIFT MACNEILL: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that he promised this Bill a year and a half ago?

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL: If the right hon. Gentleman cannot promise a Bill this session, will he give the House an opportunity of discussing this question on the Vote for the salaries of the Law Officers of the Crown?

Finance Bill.

Mr. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he proposes to proceed with the Finance Bill immediately on the conclusion of the Report stage of the Licensing Bill.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: As at present advised I propose to proceed with the Finance Bill when the proceedings in Committee on the Licensing Bill are concluded.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): I have to ask the Prime Minister whether he can make any statement as to business, and particularly as to the Supply for Thursday.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I understand it will be most convenient that the Irish Estimates shall be taken on Thursday.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The right hon. Gentleman is not yet able to say anything about the War Office Vote?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: No, Sir. It cannot be taken next Thursday, but I hope there will be no long delay.

LICENSING BILL (PROCEDURE).

Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Amendment to Question [1st July], "That the proceedings in Committee and on Report of the Licensing Bill shall be brought to a conclusion in the manner hereinafter mentioned in six allotted days—

(a) The proceedings in Committee on Clause 1 on the first allotted day.

(b) The proceedings in Committee on Clauses 2 and 3 on the second allotted day.

(c) The proceedings in Committee on Clause 4 on the third allotted day.

(d) The proceedings in Committee on the remaining clauses of the Bill, and on any new Government clauses, and on schedules and any new Government schedules, and any other proceedings necessary to bring the Committee stage to a conclusion on the fourth allotted day.

(e) The proceedings on Report on any new clauses and on Amendments to Clauses 1, 2, and 3 of that Bill, he brought to a conclusion on the fifth allotted day; and

(f) The proceedings on Report be concluded on the sixth allotted day.

After this order comes into operation, any day shall be considered an allotted day for the purposes of this Order on which the Licensing Bill is put down as the first Order of the Day.

At 11 p.m. on the said allotted days, or if the day is a Friday at 4.30 p.m., the Chairman or Speaker shall put forthwith the Question or Questions on any Amendment or Motion already proposed from the Chair, and shall next proceed successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments moved by the Government of which notice has been given (but no other Amendments) and on every Question necessary to dispose of the allotted business to be concluded on the allotted day.

In the case of Government Amendments, or of Government new clauses or schedules, he shall put only the Question that the Amendment be made, or that the clause or schedule be added to the Bill, as the case may be.

At twelve midnight of the day on which the Third Reading of the Bill is put down as first order, or, if that day is a Friday, at 5.30 p.m., the Speaker shall put forthwith any Question necessary to conclude the proceedings on that stage of the Bill.

Proceedings to which this Order relates shall not be interrupted (except at an afternoon sitting at 7.30 p.m.), under the provisions of any Standing Order relating to Sittings of the House.

After the passing of this Order, on any day on which any proceedings on the Licensing Bill stand as the first Order of the Day, no dilatory Motion on the Bill, nor under Standing Order No. 10, nor Motion to postpone a clause, shall be received, unless moved by the Minister in charge of the Bill, and the Question on any such Motion shall be put forthwith. Nor shall any opposed private business be set down at the Evening Sitting for consideration on any of the allotted days, or on the day on which the Third Reading of the Bill is put down as first Order.

If Progress be reported, the Chairman shall put this Order in force in any subsequent sitting of the Committee."—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

Which Amendment was—

"In line 1, to leave out all the words after the word 'That' and insert the words 'this House declines to consider a proposal to deprive the House of Commons, without any justification in the previous course of the debate, of all power of reasonable and adequate discussion in respect of a measure which seeks, in the absence of any authority from the country, to make fundamental and much controverted changes in laws vitally affecting the well-being of the people."—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

Question again proposed, "That the words 'the proceedings' stand part of the Question."

MR. JOHN MORLEY (Montrose Burghs): I should not have ventured to intervene in this discussion, but for the very remarkable proposition on which the Prime Minister, in making his Motion, founded his case. I confess that I listened with something like alarm to the language that then fell from the Prime Minister. I seemed to hear foreshadowed that a further Parliamentary revolution was to be added, in his opinion definitely and deliberately, by his Procedure Rules and by utterances that had fallen from him with a full responsibility, to that other revolution to which I think he has already shown us the way since last September—a revolution in the great organ of our Constitution, the solidarity and loyalty of Cabinet Government. I think this Motion, supported by the arguments which the right hon. Gentleman founded his case upon, marks as huge a stride in a revolution of Parliamentary power, Parliamentary authority, and Parliamentary fame as has ever taken place in our history. There have been five guillotine or closure Motions within recent years. The hon. Member for Altrincham said that we on this side had taken the initiative in regard to the guillotine closure. That is a complete misstatement. The first two guillotine closures were taken under the auspices of the present Prime Minister, and were taken in reference to the Parnell Commission Bill and the Crimes Act. The next two were taken in the Government of Mr. Gladstone and of Lord Rosebery. The first was the Home Rule Bill and the second the Evicted Tenants Bill. There has been a fifth guillotine closure Motion, which, for the first time, was on an English Bill. I would have the House note that the first four guillotine closures were all connected with Irish business, and that fact sheds a very considerable light on the difference in treatment that Ireland has experienced from England and Scotland in this House. The fifth guillotine closure was in 1902. I venture to assert that in all those five closures, both in the four Irish closures and in the fifth, or English, closure, two things were alleged by the Government who made the Motion corresponding to that which we are now discussing, the first urgency and the second obstruction. I was in the House during all those closures, and

I believe I am perfectly right in making that statement. I think I might note a third point—namely, that in all the three cases there had been very large and ample discussion, less, for reasons I will touch on, in the case of the Evicted Tenants Bill than in the case of the other four closures. What I want to call the attention of the House to is the new departure which the Ministry are making in the proposal they now advance. They do not contend that there has been obstruction. The silence of hon. Gentlemen opposite with which I am met when making that statement——

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I did not say so.

MR. JOHN MORLEY: Really the right hon. Gentleman, I thought, the other afternoon, if he will allow me to say so without disrespect, was rather playing with the House. Now he says he did not say so. But what did he say? He carefully abstained on Friday from even suggesting that there was obstruction. Then he does not base his case on obstruction.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes, I accept that statement, not the other one.

MR. JOHN MORLEY: Yes, he does not base his case on obstruction. I trust that hon. Gentlemen opposite, and those who support them and the Government in the Press, will note that this Motion is not based upon obstruction.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Not necessarily.

MR. JOHN MORLEY: I do not care what it is necessarily based on; I say that previously this Motion always has been based on obstruction, as one of the elements——

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, I think the right hon. Gentleman is wrong there. I have not referred to my own speech, but I do not believe he will find that I thought it worth while to allude to the obstruction in the case of the Education Bill, and I am by no means sure that obstruction formed a larger part of the argument of Mr. Gladstone over the Home Rule Bill and the Evicted Tenants Bill.

MR. JOHN MORLEY: That cannot apply to the Evicted Tenants Bill, because Mr. Gladstone had then retired from Parliament. As to the closure on the Education Bill I cannot contradict the right hon. Gentleman.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I may be wrong, but I think that was so.

MR. JOHN MORLEY: However, we will not argue that further. This Motion, this strong, drastic Motion for closure, is not based, as certainly three others of the four were based, upon obstruction. But it is not worth while to press that, because my point is that the right hon. Gentleman has advanced to a much broader position, rightly or wrongly, than has ever before been taken by a Minister making such a Motion as this. It is most remarkable, and nothing can be more worthy of the attention of the House. What does he say? He invites us—these are his points—

> "To consider this Motion in relation to the whole course, not merely of Parliamentary business in this session, but in any session. And it is because on the broadest principles that I believe there is no course open to us but that which I have adopted that I am now asking the House to adopt it."

Then he says—

> "The Parliamentary machine cannot be expected to work smoothly, efficiently, or reasonably, if too great a tax is put upon it."

as regards the duration of the session, or the labours of the session. The labours of the session! I have been over twenty years a Member of this House, and I do not think I have ever known a session—I have known many more than twenty sessions—as to which labour could be so little credited. I understand the anxieties of the session, the artifices and manœuvres of the session, the changes in relation to the order of procedure which the Government have submitted to the House. I understand, too, the efforts that Ministers have made, in resistance to our contrary efforts, not to drop the mask behind which they have been hiding themselves on the most important of all questions ever since the session began. That is one of the circumstances that account for the little business that has been done, for the absurdity of speaking of the labours of the session. One cause of the congestion of business of which the right hon. Gentleman speaks, and with which he is endeavouring to cope—one main cause of that has been the constant effort of certain of his colleagues, and I am afraid I must say especially himself, to play hide and seek with Parliament and with the country. Let any of us look back, for example, upon the week that was, not wasted, but diverted from such business as the Licensing Bill to the Scottish Education Bill. I am as much interested in the Scottish Education Bill as any other Scottish Member; it is a very important Bill; but is there a man in the House who will deny that that Bill could have been quite as adequately, if not more adequately, discussed upstairs? No English Members at all, I think, appeared upon the scenes. I charge the Government with this—they come down here and try to pretend that the Parliamentary machine has broken down, that all the old traditions of Parliament in debate are outworn, and yet we know that during that week the time of the House of Commons was withdrawn from objects with which it might well have been occupied, because—it was almost admitted by imputation in an answer to the Leader of the Opposition—because hon. Gentleman opposite, and there may be some on this side, too, for aught I know, needed to have their diversions at Ascot. What a providential thing it is for us that Goodwood and St. Leger do not happen to come in the Parliamentary session.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Goodwood does.

MR. JOHN MORLEY: I fancy it does, but very late in the session. Things, I see, are less providentially arranged than I had thought. We thoroughly understand, as it is understood on the other side, what are the Prime Minister's reasons for wishing to ring the curtain down upon one of the most squalid political scenes that has ever disfigured our Parliamentary records.

As to the other point, urgency, which has been the other pillar of these guillotine closure Motions. Some reference has been made to the closure procedure upon the Evicted Tenants Bill. I certainly am not going to argue the main question of that Bill. I see the Solicitor-General opposite, and he will correct me if I am wrong. I am perfectly prepared to defend the closure Motion made upon that occasion, not on the grounds that if the Evicted Tenants Bill had not passed Ireland would have got out of hand, and that we should have had widespread and sanguinary disorder; I never said so when I was arguing for the Bill. But there was, and it was admitted by many Gentlemen on that side of the House—there was admittedly an administrative expediency in getting some remedy for the particular social condition in Ireland before the autumn and winter faced us. I will only say that my right hon. friend the Member for Monmouth did not sanction the guillotine closure till 31st July, and if we had not proposed it then, and got that measure, it is my own firm opinion even now, so far as one's opinion is worthy of value upon such a question after ten years interval—if we had not done all we could, including the guillotine closure, to press forward that Motion—that there would have been serious disorder during the coming winter. It was the very fact that we pressed forward the Bill that produced the patience and confidence that kept certain very disturbed districts quiet. In the debate on the closure Motion to that Bill the right hon. Gentleman laid down in very distinct and emphatic language the canon, and I call the attention of the House to it, by which guillotine closure ought to be governed. What were his words?

"I admit,"

said the right hon. Gentleman—

> "there may be practical necessities which have to be got over which might justify, or even compel, this House to suspend the rights which for centuries have guarded the liberty of debate. Is this Evicted Tenants Bill one of these cases? Is there some practical, menacing necessity overhanging us which if not dealt with will impair our whole social system, or the external security of the Empire?"

I am quite willing to accept that as a canon to be applied to the closure we are now discussing. Will the right hon. Gentleman get up and tell us that there is anything imperilling our whole social system or the external security of the Empire? He cannot make any such contention. We know quite well where the urgency lies, and I make no apology for putting that point. On that occasion the right hon. Gentleman said to us—

> "What do you expect to get in exchange for this sacrifice of our dignity and our honour? I will tell you. You expect to get the votes of the Irish Members. The Irish Members expect to go to their constituents and say they did their best to obtain £250,000."

We shall get off very cheaply at the present time if this Bill does not cost us more than £250,000. We know quite well what it is that you expect. I will refer to the language used by an ardent supporter of the Government. The language has been heard before, but it is very apposite on the present occasion. It is rather racier, perhaps a little more vulgar, than one likes even to repeat. This is what was said last year by the president of one of the important licensed victuallers' associations at the annual dinner—

> "I do not think the Government will go against the trade, for we put them in power, and if they treat us properly we will keep them in power, but if they do not we will chuck them out."

That is the urgency; and I confess it is painful to me, who am as jealous as other people of the honour of this House and of the honour of British government, to think that such pressure should have produced such a proposal as we are now discussing. Sir Robert Peel, when he was being hunted and harried by the protectionists—just as the protectionists, I understand, are hunting and harrying now—said—

> "I have no desire to be Minister of England, but if I am Minister of England, so long as I hold that post I will hold it by no servile tenure."

Can we imagine anyone holding by a tenure more servile than that indicated in the passage I have just read? I have no desire to lecture the right hon. Gentleman; I should be presumptuous if I did; but I cannot help recalling the four occasions prior to 1902 when the guillotine closure was applied. In the first two cases the Leader of the House, Mr. Smith, attended vigiliantly and assiduously, watched the proceedings of the House, and felt his way for a justification for his proposal. [Mr. A. J. BALFOUR dissented.] Does the right hon. Gentleman deny that?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do absolutely.

Mr. John Morley.

MR. JOHN MORLEY: I was in the House in those days, and it seemed to us on this side that Mr. Smith was constantly in the House. I certainly can speak with full authority of Mr. Gladstone's conduct on the Home Rule Bill. We could not persuade him to absent himself for more than an hour or two, and very seldom for one single hour, of those eighty-two long days.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: He had introduced the Bill; it was his Bil'.

MR. JOHN MORLEY: That is so; but as Prime Minister, as Leader of the House, he would not have felt himself in a position to move so drastic a proposal as we made in 1893 unless he had vigilantly and assiduously watched the whole proceedings in the House and the whole temper and spirit of the House.

What is the case for the application of the broad principle of which the right hon. Gentleman spoke? The House meets in February. In regard to the great Bill of the session, the proper course from his precedent would appear to be not to introduce it until the House has sat for two and a half months, not to move the Second Reading for nearly a month more, and then after three, and only three, effective Parliamentary days to come down with a thundering Motion for a guillotine closure. These are the sort of conditions which the right hon. Gentleman seems to assume justify him in making this drastic and unprecedented proposal. That is the precedent he is setting up with his great authority and great position and by his emphatic and definite language. The right hon. Gentleman's postulates and axioms mean, if they mean anything, when they are properly worked out, the abolition of the Committee stage of a Bill. Nobody in the House has had so large a share for good or for evil in legislation as the right hon. Gentleman. He must agree with me that there are many Bills in which the Committee stage is far more important really than the Second Reading stage. The workmanlike shape of a Bill, its working when it becomes law, depends much more upon the Committee stage than it does upon anything in the Second Reading stage. In his speech last Friday the Prime Minister held quite extraordinary language. He said this Licensing Bill does not contain many novel principles. I wholly dissent. It contains novel principles about the transfer of jurisdiction, about compensation, about the conditions of new licences. These proposals may be good or they may be bad, but they are novel principles. When the right hon. Gentleman says, as he did on Friday, that these principles have been thoroughly threshed out, there again I am bound to dissent from him. I do not think they have been thoroughly threshed out at all. But, be that as it may, I do not see how the right hon. Gentleman can differ from me when I say that the application of the principles of the Bill is not any less important, any less vital, than the mere formal affirmation of the principles themselves. The right hon. Gentleman says—

> "No licences are to be taken away without compensation; you have affirmed that principle, and, having done that, the best thing the House can do is to leave the rest to the draftsman and the Home Secretary."

The Home Secretary is a Gentleman of whom I will not say one single uncharitable word, but when I am asked if I will take him to be my guide in a nice discrimination among the shades of words, then I confess I am disappointed and I cannot accept that guidance. I cannot consent willingly to the doctrine that the Home Secretary and the draftsman are to supersede the Committee of the House of Commons. The right hon. Gentleman has an ingenious friend who says if we go on debating the Bill on the same scale as we have debated the first clause it will last a year and a quarter. Surely the right hon. Gentleman himself knows very well—he has had a great deal too much experience not to know—that the discussions upon the great operative, combative clauses of a Bill are certainly no test of the time that will be taken in carrying the other portions. Just look at the first clause. Apart from the question of division of jurisdiction between quarter sessions and the magistrates, there are other questions of the most supreme importance. The right hon. Gentleman said no important issue need be left undiscussed. Has he thought how many seriously important issues are left in the clause and which do need exhaustive discussion? I use the word "exhaustive" in the fair sense. Would four hours be sufficient for an exhaustive discussion on the question of liability? Yet that is all we shall have if the question comes up on a Friday. There is the question of the desirability of introducing a popular element into the local licensing authority. Many of us feel that that is a vital question, and many in the country, apart from Party politics, think that it is a vital question. Then we come to the question whether a definite reduction in proportion to population or otherwise should be made compulsory. That is another important question in which the country is profoundly interested. There is another point, not so deep as the other two, but still important — the point whether the justices are to be allowed to employ counsel, and to produce witnesses before quarter sessions, in the same way as the licensed victuallers. Surely the idea of dealing with important issues such as these raised on the first clause in six and a half hours is farcical. Look also at Clauses 2 and 3, which are to be disposed of together in six and a half hours. Listen to the opening words of Clause 2—

> "Where quarter sessions refuse the renewal of a licence under this Act, a sum equal to the difference between the value of licensed premises, calculated as if this Act had not passed—"

The Solicitor-General will agree that in these words there is material—if he were in wig and gown—for a speech for an hour's duration or more. Then we come to Clause 3, which deals with the position of the tenant of a tied house under this scheme. The right hon. Gentleman said in his speech, very cavalierly, "Oh, we have discussed the question of the tied house." But does the right hon. Gentleman see that in this third clause are raised a number of disputable questions, which cannot be answered satisfactorily except those in this House of knowledge and experience in local business are allowed to say what they have to say about them? Recollect that in the same six and a half hours are to be dealt with three Amendments put down by Gentlemen sitting on the other side of the House, the Members for East Somerset, North-west Manchester, and the University of Cambridge — Gentlemen whom we should not suspect of putting down frivolous or obstructive Amendments—which raise the vital question of gradation—that is to say, that after a certain number of years the compensation is to be less than at an early period. What fair or candid man will contend that these are Amendments which ought to be ruled out or to be discussed at the fag end of a six and a half hours discussion? It is perfectly ridiculous. Then we come to Clause 4, which is to have six and a half hours to itself. That clause sets up a completely new licensing system. I do not judge it; I am only describing it. But it undoubtedly revolutionises the whole system of licensing. The right hon. Gentleman, speaking on that point also in a very free-handed way, said—

> "The Bill embodies the principle that new licences shall only be granted under conditions which will prevent a monopoly from growing up, a most important principle upon which there is no division of opinion between the two sides of the House."

The right hon. Gentleman takes it for granted that, if there is no division of opinion between the two sides of the House, there is no occasion for discussion. Happily, the value of our discussions do not depend upon the controversial issues which are raised between the two sides of the House. This House exists to mould and shape the legislative proposals which are laid before it. And for the right hon. Gentleman to assume that upon a Bill of this kind the House of Commons, representative though it be of all parties, and full of local experience, cannot contribute anything in a full discussion to make the measure weather-tight, water-tight, is certainly the worst compliment that has ever been paid to the House. I heard the hon. and gallant Member for the Newport Division of Shropshire say on Friday that there was a concerted conspiracy on this side to prevent the fair consideration of the Bill. The hon. and gallant Gentleman has just been appointed to the Privy Council. I can only admonish him that we of the Privy Council never use random and reckless language of that kind. But no doubt he will acquire a more temperate tone of speech in that august assembly. There were able, and eloquent, and powerful speeches delivered from this side of the House on Friday, but the most pungent of all the speeches against the Motion were made on the Government side. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Cambridge University made a thoroughly well-weighted contribution to the deeper elements of the discussion. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Somerset, a supporter of the Bill, declared that if this Motion be pressed he and his friends will be unable to vote for the Third Reading. Then there is the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for North Armagh, who said he did not like the Bill, but he should vote for it for reasons that were judged to be operative in his own mind, but which were not relevant to the issue. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman said he should go into the lobby with the Ministers because he had a mandate to keep in a Unionist Government and to keep out a Separatist Government. The hon. Member for the Altrincham Division declared that it was not with a very happy conscience that he should give his vote for the Motion. The hon. Member further said—and I call the particular attention of the House to this, because I am sure that in the next Parliament the question will be taken up—"the necessity of closuring the Bill was one of the many condemnations they had had of the new Rules of Procedure." I think that is perfectly and absolutely true. If ever there was a Bill that needed to be moulded and shaped by the full discussion of this House it is the Licensing Bill. Half the social questions which interest and perplex social reformers of all shades are touched by our licensing system. Some of the deepest questions that have troubled the administration of local self-government are also touched by changes in the licensing system. If you think of the enormous interest—I might almost say the unparalleled interest—which at this moment is taken in this measure by the one side and the other on the temperance question, and by all sects, Churches, and parties, you will realise the disgust, the anger, the concern in which they will see that all those points which need minute discussion, and in which they take such deep interest, are to be shut out of the purview of the House of Commons, which is their representative Chamber, and to be settled by the draftsman and the Home Secretary.

I will only make one observation to the right hon. Gentleman, who, we all know, takes a serious and long-sighted view of the risks of democratic Government. I do not think he will differ from me when I say that no object ought to be more dear to the Legislature than that the people of the country should take an interest in the laws of the country. But if you proceed to change the spirit and the method in which the laws are made, depend upon it you will change the spirit in which the people obey the laws and revere the Parliament which makes them. It is not an accident that alongside of this Bill there is a Bill to be pressed, I understand, called the Defaulting Authorities Bill. If you persist in this line which the right hon. Gentleman foreshadows, of making laws without that full and free discussion which has given the people of this country confidence in the laws, and made the laws respected and obeyed, then you will lose that element in our national life which has made us the most law-abiding of all peoples, and given to our institutions a stability which is possessed by those of no other country. I will conclude by quoting words which the right hon. Gentleman used when we proposed the Evicted Tenants closure Motion—not that it gives me any pleasure to reproduce them, but I think they define the present situation. The right hon. Gentleman said to us sitting there—

> "Indulge in this petty and sordid trafficking for votes if you like, but do not ask us to help you to make the honour and the dignity and the traditions of this House counters in the sorry game you are playing for political support. Do not ask us to take a hand."

With those words I close my observations.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) said that he and his hon. friends who sat with him representing Ireland in this House, intended to give a solid vote against this Resolution for closure by compartments. In taking that course they followed the unvarying record of the Irish Party. There was no section of Members in that House who had so vital an interest in maintaining the privileges of private Members as the Irish, for the reason that no matter how Governments came and went, and who sat on the Treasury Bench, the Irish Members were always anchored in opposition, a small minority, and therefore it followed that they always opposed anything tending to interfere with the privileges of private Members and the rights of minorities. On this occasion they took this action irrespective altogether of the merits and demerits of this particular Bill. On that there was a difference of opinion in the ranks of the Irish Party. In their ranks were men holding extreme views on both aspects, both as affecting the liquor traffic and temperance reform. Many years ago when Mr. Parnell founded the Nationalist Party and laid down rules for its guidance, he laid down the wise rule that on questions of this kind they should never invoke the power of the Party. He was old enough to remember when that was the rule in English Parties, and he was not sure that by that means the cause of temperance had not been advanced. With regard to these measures dealing with the liquor traffic, some had opposed and some had supported them, but the larger section had taken no part in the voting. He himself had always been in favour of the principle of compensation. More than once he had voted for it. Last year he voted in favour of the Second Reading of the Bill introduced by the hon. Member for York, and although there were portions of the present Bill he personally intensely disliked, he voted in favour of the principle of compensation on the Second Reading.

The question of closure by compartments, however, should not be looked at from the narrow point of view of the merits or demerits of the Bill. The Motion had not been proposed as a desperate expedient to meet a desperate crisis in the conduct of the affairs of the House. On the contrary, the Prime Minister put it forward as a great principle and a great precedent to be followed in the conduct of the ordinary business of the House in future, and this, to his mind, differentiated the present proposal from any similar Motion ever before the House. In 1887, when closure by compartments was proposed on the Coercion Bill, the Bill had been fifteen days in Committee, and it was notorious that there was an open declaration by Members for Nationalist constituencies that they would exercise every form of the House to prevent the Bill being passed. On the other hand, the Government claimed that the passage of the Bill was necessary to protect life and property, and secure law and order in Ireland. On the Home Rule Bill of 1893 a similar state of things arose The Bill had been twenty-eight days in Committee, and was opposed by a strong and powerful Opposition, who declared openly that they would exercise every device in their power to prevent its passing. So two years ago on the Education Bill, the Bill had been twenty-eight days in Committee,and there was an Opposition which did not disguise the fact that it intended to use every possible means to defeat the measure. Could it be honestly said that there were now, as then, special circumstances justifying a desperate and special expedient? The real facts were notorious. On several occasions, when the House was ready for a division the Government Whips had put up speakers to postpone a division until their supporters had arrived, [OPPOSITION cheers.] If the Prime Minister could have come to the House, as the Leader of the House on former occasions, and have been able to say, "We have done our best; but here is a Bill which has been obstructed in such a way and so long that unless you allow us to take some extraordinary remedy the will of the majority will be absolutely set at nought by the minority," then there might have been something to say for the Resolution, though its form would still be open to great objection. But the Prime Minister made no such demand. His argument all through his speech was that under the existing system no great measure introduced by any Government, if vigorously opposed, could be passed into law without some such device as closure by compartments. That argument entirely changed the whole character of his demand. They were asked to create a new precedent which would be put into force for all time in the House, namely, to declare that where there were no exceptional circumstances or difficulties, where there was no obstruction, and no crisis, abstract powers should be put in force to close discussion on a measure of the most far-reaching importance.

The Prime Minister stated that under the present system of transacting business there was a very gloomy future before the House of Commons, and that there were only two alternatives, viz., absolute impotence and closure by compartments. Surely such a prospect ought to give pause to every believer in Parliamentary institutions. If the country once came to the conclusion that the House was impotent, that it was unable to transact the legislation brought before it, or to supply an effective check by discussion and had degenerated into a mere talking shop, the House of Commons would receive and would deserve the contempt of the people. It would not occupy a much better position in the eyes of the people and the country generally if it were proved that the only way in which any Government could in the future pass a great measure was by putting a stop to deliberation and suppressing free speech. If it became a regular practice, the House would have ceased to be a deliberative Assembly, and would merely register the decrees of a small number of gentlemen called a Cabinet. The whole *raison d'être* of the Assembly would have disappeared, and that alternative would be just as fatal to the survival of representative and Parliamentary institutions in this country as the other alternative of impotence to which the Prime Minister had alluded. There was a possibility only hinted at by the right hon. Gentleman of some great statesman in the future being able so to arrange the rules of the House that it would be able to transact its business. But no new Rules of Procedure would cure the disease from which the House was suffering. Since the year 1832 there had been eighteen Committees of the House of Commons deliberating upon new Rules. Again and again reforms had been introduced to facilitate the business of the House, and yet year by year the difficulties had been increasing. In 1902 they had a brand new code of Rules brought in by the right hon. Gentleman himself for the purpose of facilitating business. The House should recollect the circumstances under which those Rules were introduced. They were brought in by probably one of the ablest statesmen England had ever seen, who was surrounded by a galaxy of talent, backed by an unexampled majority, and possessing absolute powers to carry any proposals he chose to bring forward. After mature deliberation a series of new Rules were introduced which, in the words of the Prime Minister—

> "Would leave this House . . . not merely as a machine for passing legislation, but a free arena in which questions interesting to the country may be discussed."

And now, after two years' experience, the right hon. Gentleman told the House there were only two alternatives before them—one of absolute impotence and the other closure by compartments.

But a far more serious consideration than the effect of this Motion upon this or that measure was the future of the House of Commons as a deliberative and legislative Assembly. It was amazing to him that he had not heard any speaker go to the root of the matter. The House was attempting an impossible task—a task day by day becoming more impossible under the new conditions that had arisen owing to a variety of causes. It was physically impossible that one legislative Assembly, even if it sat every day in the year, could fulfil the duties of a great Imperial Senate and also the duties of half-a-dozen local Parliaments as well. It was perfectly true that his argument on these procedure questions was always the same, but every session's experience demonstrated the truth and increased the force of his contention. He was not now arguing for Home Rule for Ireland, that question rested upon an entirely different set of considerations; he was trying in all seriousness of spirit to look at the question from the point of view of the House, of a Member of the House of Commons, and of a man who was a believer in Parliamentary institutions, and in all seriousness he declared that the Government were subjecting Parliamentary institutions to a strain they could not stand, and under which they would completely break down if the present course were persisted in. The more coercive proceedings of this kind were proposed, the more they would have to be increased. No more humiliating confession of the breakdown of the Parliamentary machine could have been made than that of the Prime Minister, viz., impotence or the "gag." The closure when first proposed was put forward as a device which would be used only in exceptional circumstances; it was a strong and drastic medicine to be applied only in cases of grave disorder; it had now become a part of the ordinary everyday diet of the House of Commons. So it would be with closure by compartments. For the first time, the House was being asked to adopt this procedure, not to ease the dangers of a special situation, but on general principles to enable the Government to carry a great measure in the face of a vigorous Opposition. In a comparatively short space of time the House would find closure by compartments a part of its ordinary everyday procedure.

Not only the possibility, but the absolute absurdity of the present system was self-evident. The House of Commons was the great Senate of the Empire, governing great Imperial interests of hundreds of millions of people in different parts of the world—an Assembly whose time ought to be devoted to the consideration of questions upon which, perhaps, the peace of the world or the interests of humanity depended; and it was at the same time the local Parliament of England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland, charged with the duty of legislating for and supervising the administration of the smallest local and comparatively insignificant affairs of each portion of the so-called United Kingdom. The result was lamentable, but it was also ludicrous. At one moment this great Imperial Senate was called upon to discuss questions of Imperial importance affecting the whole Empire, and sometimes the whole civilised world; and then, suddenly, those questions were automatically hung up in order that the same Imperial Senate might discuss the dismissal of a policeman in Ireland or the alleged interference with St. Winifred's Well in Wales. The other day he was visited by a distinguished official from one of the most distant parts of the Empire. This gentleman had been absent from England for many years, and returned filled with the proudest thoughts of the greatness of the Empire. Never having heard a debate in the House of Commons, he asked him (the hon. and learned Member) to secure him a place under the gallery. He entered the House with feelings almost of reverential awe, and then to his amazement he heard the House discussing for an hour and a half how best to deal with bugs and fleas in tenement houses. The position was absolutely ludicrous; it was also very serious. The latest edition of the Rules of Procedure were admitted by this Resolution to have been an absolute failure, and the closure by compartments would degrade, humiliate, and finally destroy. The House of Commons was being gradually suffocated and strangled to death, its only hope was to follow the example of other great nations similarly circumstanced by making a distinction between Imperial and local concerns, and thus affording time for the efficient government of both.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I will not repeat the criticism which I have previously passed upon some of the interventions in our constitutional debates by the hon. Member, for he has referred to that criticism in a very good-humoured spirit; and as to the contention which he has advanced to-day, I do not at all traverse one of the main pillars upon which he has built his thesis—namely, that this House does devote too much time to the details of measures, and thereby to a certain extent loses the sense of proportion and has not enough time to consider the principles of measures. I will point out to the hon. Member that he is in absolute disagreement with an eminent statesman who agrees with him on the subject of Home Rule in advancing that proposition, for the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Montrose complains—he did not pretend, he could not pretend, that any great principle underlying this Bill was undiscussed—what he said was that in order to make it a workable measure, in order that it might really carry out the intentions of its framers and of the House, it was necessary that the details should be hammered out on the floor of the House. It is no great interest of mine to knock together the heads of two such eminent persons who evidently, although they are going to vote on the same side, approach this matter from an entirely different standpoint, Home Rulers though they both be. The hon. Gentleman in his defence of the British Constitution seems to me to have forgotten facts in the historic career of himself and the Party which he leads because he told us, unless I entirely misunderstood his meaning, that he had always opposed Motions of this kind.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: No. I said the the Irish Party had invariably cast their votes against interference with freedom of speech and the rights of private Members of this House. I believe that statement is quite accurate.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not wish to put into the hon. Gentleman's words any meaning which he did not intend to put into them himself. But surely he meant the House to understand that closure by compartments was an interference with the freedom of speech and the rights of the House, and so neither he nor his friends could support it; nor had they been found to support it in the past. The hon. Gentleman has forgotten what has taken place. To begin with, he did not vote against the closure by compartments on the Education Bill two years ago.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: I was not here; I was in America.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: None of his friends did. In the second place, he did vote for the closure by compartments both of the Home Rule Bill and of the Evicted Tenants Bill. I quite understand. I do not complain. The hon. Gentleman, in pursuance of what, no doubt, are perfectly legitimate tactics, desires to support the Opposition in this particular controversy. But do not let him come down to the House and, with an air of Roman virtue, declare that now he is merely carrying out a policy pursued in fair weather and in rainy weather alike by himself and his friends throughout a long period of Parliamentary history. If he goes back to the records of this House he will find that no such case can be made out.

I am sorry that the course which this debate has taken will compel me, in the few minutes which I shall occupy in the reply which courtesy to the House requires me to make, to deal with some accusations which are of a more or less personal character, and are rather on one side of the important proposition which we are asked to discuss to-day. The right hon. Gentleman who opened the debate this afternoon, in a speech of great courtesy, attacked me in a manner which I do not complain of for not having been present all through the debates in Committee on this Bill, his view being that my absence from some of these debates in Committee disqualified me for forming an opinion of the propriety or impropriety of the steps I am now asking the House to adopt. Well, Sir, it is perfectly true that this Bill is not under my personal conduct. As the right hon. Gentleman says, I believe, for good or for evil, I have personally conducted more important measures through this House than any Member of it now living, and the House will admit, I think, that I have never shrunk from the labour of detail which that responsibility throws upon me. But I do not believe that it is in accordance with precedent or in the best interests of this House that it should be understood as a matter of course that the Leader of the House for the time being is to be responsible for all its important Bills. The right hon. Gentleman alluded to my lamented friend Mr. Smith, and said he was present throughout the debates on the Crimes Act. Sir, he was rarely present; he entrusted to me the whole responsibility for the conduct of that measure, and I do not think he thought it necessary to sit through the debates. May I be permitted to make this further addition to what I have said on this subject? Some Members of the House seem to be of opinion that it is in pursuit of some personal leisure that I am absent from this Bench. I can only say that the moments of greatest repose which I have in the course of a somewhat laborious official career are the moments I spend on this Bench. It may not be agreeable to listen to a series of tirades directed either against myself or against the policy of the Government, but it is not fatiguing. If I am not present upon this Bench, I can assure the House that I am invariably engaged in matters which, if not of more importance, at all events involve much greater personal labour and exertion. Even as regards this Bill, I may say that I made a speech on the First Reading of it, that I made a speech on the Second Reading, and that I have intervened once or twice while it has been in Committee, and those interventions have been objected to by hon. Gentlemen opposite. Nobody can say I have left this Bill severely alone in the sense, for instance, in which Mr. Smith left to me the sole conduct of the Crimes Act and other large measures of Irish legislation with which, while he was Leader, I was entrusted.

That is perhaps a small matter. But I am afraid there is one other personal point which I cannot leave wholly alone. I have not been merely accused of leaving this Bill without sufficient superintendence, I have been accused, in perfectly unmistakable language, of having had my judgment as regards this Bill entirely perverted by the society which, according to the hon. Member for Spen Valley Division, I have been accustomed to keep. He refers, I understand, to the two or three days in the year which I am sorry to say are all, while in office, that I have been able to give to my constituency. But that minute fragment of the year, according to the hon. Gentleman's judgment, has been enough to corrupt at its source any estimate which I am able to frame upon a question in which licence-holders or brewers may be concerned. Well, Sir, I do not know that the hon. Member's estimate of my judgment is a matter on which I need detain the House, but I deeply regret that he should have thought it desirable in his interests or in anybody's interests to make a personal attack upon me which involved the reputations of two other persons, one of whom has long been dead, and the other of whom is in no sense open to the insinuation or suggestion which the hon. Gentleman, taking advantage of his position in this House, has made against him. He has chosen to attack my present chairman. My present chairman has never made any observation to me directly or indirectly upon this Bill or upon any other question of Governmental policy. But, in any case, as far as I am aware, his interests are no more affected by this Bill than the interests of the chairman of the hon. Gentleman himself, and I assume that the chairman of the hon. Gentleman is neither a brewer nor a licence-holder. And I must say the case is far worse with reference to the suggestion made by the hon. Member in regard to one who was many years ago my chairman and who was a brewer.

MR. WHITTAKER (Yorkshire, W.R., Spen Valley): I made no reference to him.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman talked of scandals in my constituency, which can only be interpreted as having reference to a story of which I just heard——

MR. WHITTAKER: I was making no reference to that gentleman. I was referring to the scandals in Manchester—the well-known scandals in connection with the watch committee, of which Sir John Marks was chairman, and the police. That is why I referred to the chief constable. I am afraid the right hon. Gentleman does not know of them.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I admit I do not closely follow municipal affairs, which have nothing to do with my connection with Manchester.

MR. WHITTAKER: A national scandal.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: If the hon. Gentleman wishes to attack the Corporation of Manchester or any member of it he is at liberty to do so, but do not let him associate me with matters of that kind. The sincerity of the hon. Gentleman is beyond doubt; of his charity I have seen but few fragments. I think it would be well, I will not say for him, but for his cause, if he could persuade the House or anybody else that what animates him in this matter is not a personal aversion to a trade or to a class, but a desire to carry out that which this Bill will undoubtedly carry out—namely, a great temperance reform. The hon. Gentleman says that we are the slaves of a trade. May I point out to him and to the House that we do conceive that this measure, in addition to all that we have a right to hope from it in the direction of temperance reform, does, in our opinion, do justice to a trade? We have never disguised that, and we believe it; and, what is more, that has been part of the creed of the vast majority of the Gentlemen sitting on this side of the House. If it be true that we are doing justice to a particular trade, are we disgraced because that trade expresses its desire to see that justice done to it? Can anything be more childish than to suppose that because the licence-holder desires to see this Bill pass—— [OPPOSITION] cries of "The brewer.") We will not quarrel. The licence-holder, the brewer, the holders of brewery shares, the insurance companies who hold brewery shares, in which, I daresay, the hon. Gentleman has insured his life—they may all be protected from injustice by this Bill; and why should they not say so, and what disgrace is there if we, holding the view that we are doing them a benefit, should accept these over-statements of their gratitude? The hon. Gentleman talked of our coming to "the crack of the whip." I suppose he meant the votes which this Bill is expected to give to the present holders of office. That sporting metaphor is capable of extension. I could not help looking at the face of the hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Irish Party while the hon. Member for the Spen Valley was speaking, and I thought I saw a faint smile cross his face, probably produced by a reminiscence of the Evicted Tenants Bill, to which I shall refer in a moment, and I thought that, after all, perhaps "the crack of the whip" had been heard before in other quarters. And in a moment of unaccustomed prophecy I looked forward and I thought it not impossible that from the same quarter, and adjusted to the same victims, "the crack of the whip" might be heard at no distant date. [Cheers and some OPPOSITION cries of "When?"] Well, whenever the followers of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Waterford are in the position they were in between the years 1893 and 1895. I do not know that that position will recur, but I think it may; and then the hon. Gentleman the Member for the Spen Valley will have ample experience in illustration of the constitutional position which at present gives him such acute pain.

I turn from the hon. Member for Spen Valley to the defenders of the Constitution—the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Fife, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wolverhampton, and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Montrose. I think they can hardly have examined or refreshed their memory with anything connected with the previous incidents which are parallel to this occasion except in giving a most devoted study to the speeches I have made on these occasions. I accuse them of no neglect in that respect, but in every other respect they have really fallen into blunder after blunder. Some of these blunders I will venture to bring to the notice of the House. In the first place the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Montrose has told us that I am the first person and that this is the first occasion on which any such measure has been proposed without making obstruction the chief argument in favour of it. That is a complete delusion. I have not looked up my own speeches on the Education Bill, but I have looked through Mr. Gladstone's speech on the Home Rule Bill and the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouth, who moved a corresponding Motion to this on the Evicted Tenants Bill, and neither of those statesmen made any nearer reference to obstruction than I have made myself. I pointed out that if progress was to be at this rate the Bill would never be finished. I pointed out, as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Monmouth pointed out, that the number of Amendments on the Paper was such that it was incredible that in any reasonable time we should be able to dispose of them. The only difference between us was that, while the right hon. Gentleman opposite appealed to twenty-two pages of Amendments, it was my privilege to appeal to sixty-five pages of Amendments. In other words, I had an argument precisely three times as strong as he was able to produce. So much for the first point.

The next accusation made against me, also by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Montrose, is that I have devised an entirely new principle to justify this violation of the liberties of the House. I have not put it, he says, on obstruction, but I have put it on the general principle that the House cannot conduct its business if it is required to sit during the length of time which evidently would be required were this Bill to follow its natural course. I agree that that was my main argument, and I also admit that when I used it I was not conscious that I was guilty of plagiarism. But it has been since pointed out to me that precisely that argument, almost in my words, was used by Mr. Gladstone on a precisely similar occasion—that is to say, on the closure of the Home Rule Bill on the 29th of June, 1893. Mr. Gladstone said—

> "We are compelled, by the arrangement of our finances, to regulate our Parliamentary proceedings by the revolution of the year. But, the year containing twelve months, it is obviously impossible for the Members of this House to devote the whole of those twelve months to the direct discharge of their public duties within these walls. The common practice of Parliament has been for the last sixty years, since the passing of the first Reform Act, to devote six months, or perhaps seven months, to the discharge of those duties; and, in assigning to them so large a portion of the year, I believe I may correctly say Parliament has gone beyond what has ever been attempted—beyond what has ever been done by any other deliberative Assembly in the world."

That is precisely the general argument which I have used to the House. So much for the new principle which the right hon. Gentleman, far above my merits, credits me with having discovered in defence of the present proposal. But let us go a little closer into this matter. The three defenders of the Constitution to whom I have referred were all responsible both for the closure by compartments on the Home Rule Bill and for the closure by compartments upon the Evicted Tenants Bill. The two charges made against this proceeding are, in the first place, that we are putting on the closure too quickly, and the other is that the closure we desire to put on will exclude the discussion of very important questions; the compartments are too small. I will examine both these propositions in the light of precedent in which the right hon. Gentleman took a leading part. As regards the length of time during which the discussion has gone on, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife talked about x days as having been spent in Committee; but the time taken in the Committee on the Evicted Tenants Bill was only two days. What is the reply to that? The reply made by the other side is that the Evicted Tenants Bill stood by itself, that it was a great measure of public order; and that if it had not been carried through this House, if further delay had been allowed, there would have been crime in the winter and agrarian disorganisation in Ireland for many months. So flimsy a pretext has never, I think, been seriously advanced in this House by responsible statesmen. Let me remind them of some of the dates. They came into office in 1892, but the claims of social order in Ireland are not attempted to be dealt with until 1894. That is nearly three years.

Mr. JOHN MORLEY: I would remind the right hon. Gentleman that a Commission was appointed.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I thought the right hon. Gentleman would remind me of that Commission. It is perfectly true that the right hon. Gentleman and his friends appointed a Commission. It sat and it reported in the spring of 1893—let the House mark the date—while the Home Rule Bill was going on; and I presume it was on the Report of that Commission that the right hon. Gentleman and his friends thought this was a pressing question in connection with public order in Ireland. I do not blame them, even in the interests of public order in Ireland, for not interrupting the discussions on the Home Rule Bill to carry out the Report of the Commission. But what did they do when the Home Rule Bill was kicked out by the House of Lords? Did they then go on with the Evicted Tenants Bill, which was desired so urgently to preserve law and order in Ireland? Not at all. They occupied six months more of the session—we sat, as the House remembers, to a date in the following year—with the English Parish Councils Bill and other matters, no doubt of considerable parochial importance, but matters which no one can pretend ought to stand in the way of a measure which was really required to preserve law and order in Ireland. That brings me to 1894. And then what did they do about this measure required for law and order in Ireland? We have been told that we have shown an iniquitous disregard for the interests of the House because we only introduced the Licensing Bill on 20th April of this year. I admit that they have the better of us there by fully twenty-four hours, because their Bill for preserving law and order in Ireland was introduced on 19th April. But though we cannot compete with them as to the date of introduction, we really can compete with them as to the ardour and the urgency with which we pursued our policy. We have been reproached on that subject also. We have been told that the House had almost forgotten where they left off with the Licensing Bill, so great was the delay that occurred between the introduction and the later stages of it. We are only now in the very first days of July. When does the House think this urgent measure of law and order, introduced on 19th April was read a second time? Exactly three months after its introduction. Law and order in Ireland had to wait for Welsh Disestablishment, the death duties, and other matters, no doubt of great importance, but of less importance than law and order in Ireland, which had to wait for these three months. And yet we are seriously told that a Bill which was only read a second time on 20th July, some months after the Commission reported, was of such an urgent character that after two days in Committee the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Monmouth was justified in coming down and in a speech which in *Hansard* takes up, I think, a column, and in which law and order does not appear any more than obstruction, or if it appears, scarcely appears—we are told that closure by compartment was absolutely necessary. No, Sir, it was the crack of that whip of which we have heard so much, which produced this immediate necessity for dealing with law and order which would no longer wait, and for which the liberties of debate and the dignity of this House were so readily sacrificed by such ardent supporters of the British Constitution as the Member for Waterford and his friends. So much for the first count in the indictment, which says that we have introduced this closure too early in the proceedings.

Now we come to the second count, and I venture to think a much more important count, in the indictment, which says that our compartments are so contrived that nothing like adequate discussion can be found for the questions that remain. [OPPOSITION cheers.] I am surprised after the little historical disquisition I have given to the House that that should be cheered by hon. Gentlemen opposite. I am not going through, compartment by compartment, the arrangements made by Mr. Gladstone and the three defenders of the Constitution with regard to the Home Rule Bill, but I will take one compartment as a specimen. It is the week-long compartment, which comprised five Parliamentary days, and was concluded on 13th July. In those five days eighteen clauses were to be discussed; an average of three or three-and-a-quarter a day. What were those clauses? Did they consist of those details which the right hon. Member for Montrose think ought to be so carefully smoothed out, and made watertight and practicable on the floor of the House? I will tell the House what they contained. The first one dealt with the absolutely vital question as to whether the Irish Members in this House were or were not to be allowed to vote upon questions which affected only England, Scotland, or Wales, perhaps the most crucial point in the whole Bill. During the course of those five days, in fact I think on the last day but one of the five—and this was the first of eighteen clauses to be embraced in the five days—on the penultimate day of that compartment, it seems almost incredible, but it is the fact, Mr. Gladstone came down and told the House, "We have entirely altered the plan of this Bill." He told the House that, whereas his original idea, the idea which we had discussed for four days, had been to have the Irish Members in this House only for purposes in which Ireland was concerned, he had come to the conclusion after four days debate that they must be included for all purposes. And when he made that declaration there was only one day remaining in the compartment, so we literally had to decide this, which was not detail but a fundamental constitutional principle, under closure in the last day of the compartment. That is not nearly all, because there remained the seventeen other clauses. And what did these seventeen clauses deal with? Details comparable to Clause 3 in this Bill? They dealt with the whole complicated financial proposals of the Bill with regard to the Consolidated Fund, the hereditary revenues, the financial arrangements between Great Britain and Ireland, and with regard to the Irish Consolidated Fund, the local taxation accounts, and money Bills. I do not think I have finished the enumeration, but I think I have said enough. Where were the defenders of the Constitution when that was done? Where was the Member for Wolverhampton, the Member for East Fife, the Member for Montrose?

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): What did you say to it?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I was on that side of the House. They were cheering on their great Leader; that was their notion of closure by compartments, that was the length of time they thought ought to be given to the details of a Bill. And then they actually come down here and tell us, the very men who thought two days in Committee a sufficient allowance in the case of the Evicted Tenants Bill before closure by compartment was moved, and a compartment of five days long enough in which to discuss eighteen clauses of the character which I have described—these men come down, and, with an indignation which I will not say is mock, but which surely is founded upon a most convenient forgetfulness, they accuse us of having gone too far in this matter. I have been taunted, almost, with not accusing hon. Gentlemen of obstruction. Well, I do not mean to accuse them of obstruction now. They may take it as an accusation or not as they please, I will state a fact which I do not believe a single one of them will deny. It is this — were the House to accept this Amendment, and were the House thereupon to plunge into the sixty-five pages of Amendments already upon the Paper, which, as I said on Friday, are probably mere rude and inadequate sketches of the changes that would be proposed if we went on as we are doing now, I do state as a fact that the Parliamentary machine would break down. I do not believe there is a single man on the other side of the House who doubts it. [OPPOSITION cries of "Oh!"] I go the length, not of saying that they desire in the abstract that the Parliamentary machine should break down, but that they do emphatically desire that it should break down while we have the management of it; they all know it; it is common talk. If it were not common talk, you have only got to look at the Order Paper, and you can see that it is true. And are we to be debarred from taking a proceeding which, compared with what they have done in the past, sinks into absolute insignificance because they are of opinion that the Parliamentary liberties, which have survived the action of Mr. Gladstone on the Home Rule Bill, and have survived the action of the Member for Monmouth on the Evicted Tenants Bill, are now imperilled by the modest proposals we are making? [OPPOSITION cries of "Oh!"] Perhaps not modest absolutely, modest relatively, modest as compared with what a greater generation than we have attempted and carried successfully against resistance. I do not think the contention would stand for a moment. The truth is that if the House decided not to pass this Motion, they will do nothing for their own liberties. The precedents that those Gentlemen, when they come into office, will look back on, are not our precedents on this Bill, they are their own precedents on other Bills. What you would do would be to destroy the chances of the passage of a Bill which I believe in my heart and conscience is going, not only to do justice to a trade, but is going to do more for temperance reform in this country not merely than anything which hon. Gentlemen opposite have done, for they have done nothing in twenty years, but more than anything which their proposals, or any proposals of theirs with which I am acquainted, could have effected if carried into law. I therefore hope that, not merely in the interests of what to me appear the true interests of this great legislative Assembly, but in the interests also of the particular Bill with which we are concerned, the House will, by an overwhelming majority, support us in the action we are taking.

Mr. A. J. Balfour.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) said that the Prime Minister, in making his interesting comparison anent the Home Rule Bill and the Evicted Tenants Bill and this Bill had forgotten the sequel to the Home Rules Bill. That Bill, too, was eighty-foure days in Committee, ten times as long as the right hon. Gentleman proposed to give to the present measure, although he did not think anyone would say that the Home Rule question was ten times more important than the temperance question to the country. The sequel was that the Home Rule Bill, very largely because of the compartment closure, was thrown out by the House of Lords; an appeal was then made to the country, and the country took the same view as had the Opposition of that day. That was a story of some significance for the right hon. Gentleman. With regard to the Evicted Tenants Bill, his withers were unwrung, for he agreed with the then Opposition and did not himself vote for the closure Motion, thinking it a great mistake and a dangerous precedent which trenched on the liberties of Parliament, and what happened afterwards justified his action. He agreed that each case must be taken on its merits. But in the case of the Evicted Tenants Bill, a proposal merely to spend £250,000—wisely or unwisely—upon the settlement of a vexed question in Ireland was not to be compared for one moment in matter and magnitude to the proposals in the Bill introduced by the right hon. Gentleman.

Take each case, said the right hon. Gentleman, on its merits; but had the right hon. Gentleman taken the present case on its merits? What he had done was to evolve a fantastic theory about the allocation of Parliamentary time. It was a most preposterous theory that legislation must go through without criticism. The Home Rule Bill had been discussed in the country for six years, and came before the House as the result of a mandate. What about the present proposals? The right hon. Gentleman rather scoffed at a mandate. He would not argue that the House of Commons had no right to pass any Bill unless the subject matter had been the subject of consideration before the House was elected. That was not the point here. The point here was not a constitutional point, but a point of honour. If the leaders of a Party went to the country and said to the electors, "You are asked to settle one question, and you are not asked to express any opinion on other questions," deliberately, with a view to procuring the votes of men who disagreed with them, it might not be a breach of the Constitution to break that pledge, but every man of honour would respect it. If before a general election the country had been thrashing out all the objections to a question, and then came to the conclusion that despite the difficulties which existed it would try the experiment, and if the Opposition afterwards proceeded to raise the same criticisms *ad infinitum*, with a view to destroying the Bill, surely, in that case the decision of the country would be an element in considering the amount of time to be given to the discussion. But in this case the question was not considered; it was brushed aside. More than that. Whenever proposals of this character were advanced in previous Parliaments the protest in the country was so strong that the Government of the day were obliged to respect the feelings of the country and drop their proposals. Yet, these proposals were introduced now merely as a result of pressure from a section of the right hon. Gentleman's own Party. That was the condition of the matter.

There was another ground on which the guillotine might be introduced and that was the ground of emergency. He would not deal with that. He had voted for the guillotine before, and might vote for it again; but it was nevertheless a crude and barbarous method of dealing with a difficulty which, he agreed with the hon. Member for Waterford, could never be dealt with until they had devolved matters of detail on local assemblies. As long, however, as this Parliament decided to retain all matters great and small there must be something of the kind. But they should consider the importance and difficulty of the question to be dealt with. There was no question more important or more difficult; or no question with reference to which a blunder would more seriously affect the well-being of the people than the question of temperance legislation. It affected millions of households; touched the habits of the people; and it was a question which had brought misery and ruin to hundreds and thousands of homes. What question could Parliament consider better than that? The right hon. Gentleman referred to the evils connected with the Beerhouses Act of 1869; but that Act was passed without consideration, and in a moment of hurry. That Act had brought untold evils on the country and surely that should be a warning to them. Had the Government considered this question candidly and sincerely on its merits, or had they been animated by other considerations? Had they considered it from the point of view of Party difficulties, and with a view of prolonging their own official life? If they had, such a thing would be an act of treason to the free institutions of this country. What was the position? The Prime Minister, when he introduced the Motion, proved that he had not really considered the whole of his own Bill in relation to this Motion. He enumerated four questions which had, he said, already been adopted in Committee. They were the basis of compensation, tied houses, and time limit, and new licences. Two out of those questions had never even been reached, and yet the right hon. Gentleman did not know it.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think the hon. Member has misquoted me.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he was certain he had not. The right hon. Gentleman said those questions had already been debated.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I was perfectly aware that Clause 4 is the clause which deals with future licences, and of course we have not reached that; but it has been referred to and the general principle of it. I thought it was a matter of common agreement.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that the question was whether it had been debated and surely that was most important. His hon. friend the Member for the Spen Valley had stated the case very moderately when he said that Clauses 2 and 3 were to receive half a day each. They had three and a quarter hours for each clause. The cardinal questions inside the two clauses which must still be debated, were the question that it should be left to the discretion of the justices to decide the compensation, the basis of compensation, the question of whether retail or wholesale profits should come into the computation (a provision affecting 85 per cent. of the public-houses in the country and which would double the amount of compensation)—the question of who was to receive the compensation, the question of what proportion, the question of who was to make the valuation, and the question raised by the hon. Member for the Brightside Division. Surely they must get a division on these questions, because it was right that the country should know how every Member voted upon those questions. That left one and three quarter hours to debate seven cardinal propositions, about fifteen minutes to each proposition, surely that was reducing the House of Commons to a perfect farce as far as discussion was concerned. But they all knew why it was done. The discussion about the division between the brewer and the publican came at the end of the clause when it could not now be raised. It was a question which the Government did not want discussed, naturally. But the Government had not considered it from that point of view, they were simply looking at the Parliamentary situation. The Prime Minister had to drop the Budget. He came back to the brewers, and there was a little bit of sugar in that so it fermented a little. There was a contrast between last week and this week. When the Budget was on the business was "flat, stale, and unprofitable," but last week they were fermenting in the brewers' mash tub. They had lost the confidence of the country. The one question the country was interested in at the present moment was when the Government was going to take its "off-licence." By-election after by-election had gone against them in spite of every effort and every manœuvre. They actually threw over the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham as a sort of Jonah to pacify the storm, but still the waves were just as high. That was what the *Standard* said. The *Standard* was of opinion that they had not drowned him but merely ducked him, and that he was still lurking somewhere near the steering gear, but still the storm was raging. They had the country against them and they were merely keeping things going until something cropped up and they could put their fiscal reform scheme upon the market. The market was depressed. In the language of the Stock Exchange protection had weakened in sympathy with slavery. Because the country had no confidence in the Government, the representatives of the country in this House were to lose their right to criticise this measure. That was the real position.

Mr. Lloyd-George.

If the right hon. Gentleman had a Parliamentary majority in which he had confidence this was not a thing that he would propose to the House of Commons. It was because he had no confidence in them that he was going to force this Bill through without giving the House an opportunity of properly considering it. It was because the Government had made up their minds to stick to office through thick and thin. The right hon. Gentleman had been very hard on those whose weakness was drunkenness, but he ought to be a little more tender to the weaknesses of human nature. They did not all lie in the same direction. With some it was drunkenness; with others it was office. But it was the business of the House to closely watch these things. This House had to see that things of this sort were not done to create evil precedents; to rush through Bills monstrous in themselves, without the House of Commons holding a firm grasp on them and doing something in order to improve them by way of Amendments. What was the urgency for this? It could not be the Budget, because there was not very much of that left. Was it the Army? There was no hurry there at all. The right hon. Gentleman was putting it through from time to time. He had a mandate there. The country expected him to deal with it; the War Minister said it was the most urgent problem of the moment, but the right hon. Gentleman, the head of the Defence Committee—a Committee charged with the defence of the Empire—who had been heralded as the greatest strategist since the Duke of Wellington, said there was no hurry, and he had laid aside the sword in order to turn the spigot. It was not the Army. Then it must be the Welsh Coercion Bill. The right hon. Gentleman said there were two contentious measures they must push forward this session, this and the Welsh Coercion Bill, or the Defaulting Authorities Bill as it was called. What was the urgency there? Again, the urgency there was not a social but a political one—a Party one. The Bishops were in arms against the Licensing Bill, and the Prime Minister gently hinted that he had a spiteful little Bill against the Welsh Nonconformists which he would give to them if they were good boys. They had all come to the conclusion that this was a pernicious Bill, greatly affecting the material and moral welfare of their flock. But the Prime Minister said, "Never mind"—that he would give them something in return; that he would hand over the Welsh county councils to them. The whole thing was tainted with corruption from the beginning to end. When the Prime Minister replied to the charge of the hon. Member for the Spen Valley that he was coming to heel at the crack of the whip, he did not deny it.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do deny it.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: The right hon. Gentleman denied that, but not in a very enthusiastic way, with his eyes closed. How could he deny it? When did he first say he was going to bring in a Bill of some sort? After the Rye and Woolwich elections; after the brewers had said, to quote the words of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Montrose, "You have got to do it, or we will chuck you out." It was the policy of retaliation. That was no doubt where the right hon. Gentleman got his idea of the big revolver. This was purely and simply a matter of bribery and corruption. The Bill was not brought forward in the public interest, or because it was of great social urgency. It was considered as a property—as a matter of electioneering. The Prime Minister said to himself, "I may have offended every man who would like to see the business of the country transacted in an efficient way; I may have alienated all those who do not like to see the resources of the country squandered; I may have hurt the consciences of those who at any rate like a policy to be put in straightforward language; I may have alienated all the moral forces of the land by a Bill of this sort. But in time to come I shall have one friend by me, and my Government will stagger to the polls arm in arm with the assistance of the trade"—a trade which, in the opinion of the great Judges of the land, had filled our gaols with criminals and our asylums with lunatics, and which, in the opinion of every expert in social reform, had increased and deepened the degradation and distress of hundreds and thousands of the people.

MR. MIDDLEMORE (Birmingham, N.) said the Prime Minister's proposal had placed some of the moderate temperance men who occupied seats behind the right hon. Gentleman in a position of considerable difficulty, and they were in doubt whether upon this question they could support the Government. They thought the Motion for closure was premature; and that there were matters in the Bill which required, but would be excluded from, discussion; and, finally, in view of the treatment which the right hon. Baronet the Member for Devonshire and some of his supporters—of whom he was one—received last Wednesday, he thought they had a right to enter a protest. As to the treatment of which he had spoken, he recalled that on Wednesday the Solicitor-General explained certain words in the first clause of the Bill, and if his exposition was correct, the right hon. Gentleman carried with him the sentiment of almost everyone on the Government side of the House, and of a very large number of Members of the Opposition. But there arose a difference of opinion upon the point among many high legal authorities, and it was alleged that the Courts of Law would put a different construction to that which the Solicitor-General placed upon the clause unless its wording were amended.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is hardly in order in discussing a particular Amendment.

MR. MIDDLEMORE: I was anxious to explain my position, Mr. Speaker, and if you will allow me to say one word more, and only one, I think it could be done. After the Solicitor-General had consented to amend the phraseology, the Prime Minister declined to accept any Amendment, and many hon. Members felt that they were unreasonably dealt with by such action.

*MR. SPEAKER again intervened.

MR. MIDDLEMORE expressed regret that he had erred so much, and said he would not refer again to the topic which had been ruled out of order. There was a question of confiscation—confiscation of the rights of private Members. He thought it was quite clear that there would be no confiscation if there were no obstruction. Between obstruction and the means of overcoming obstruction, it seemed to him that the rights of private Members were likely to pass away. If those rights were snatched away they must certainly pass to the Cabinet. Unless there was some process of dealing with the legislation of the country and doing something to relieve the Government of responsibility for it, he could not see how the House could, for a generation longer, remain an independent body. The time might come when it would be a breach of faith for a Member to vote against the Government representing the Party to which he belonged, just as it was now for a member of the American Federal College to vote against his Party. He would not wish to be a Member of the House on such despicable terms. While freedom was left to him, he would venture, at any rate on this occasion, to vote against a Government which he was most anxious to support on Unionist, Imperialist, and fiscal questions.

*MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe) thought the Prime Minister was hardly justified in claiming to have given more notice of this Resolution than had been given on former occasions. On Wednesday night he mentioned, in a nonchalant manner, that he intended to bring forward a Motion to accelerate the Licensing Bill. In consequence of the right hon. Gentleman's new-fangled rules of procedure, Thursday and Friday were practically *dies non*, as Thursdays were devoted to Supply, and Fridays were, to a large extent, given to private Members' Bills, and Members had, in consequence, become, to a much larger extent than was formerly the case, "week-enders." A notice therefore only appearing in Thursday's Paper for such important business on Friday was therefore rather sharp. He would probably not be doing the right hon. Gentleman any injustice if he stated that the Prime Minister's expectation was to get the Resolution through on Friday without much discussion, but by this time he had probably discovered that the Motion was regarded by the House in a very serious light. Personally, he agreed that one or two of the precedents set by Liberal Governments in this matter were not very good ones, and certainly some of the measures which had eventuated from such drastic proceedings did not go to justify the procedure. Many of the provisions of the Crimes Act of 1887 were dropped before the election of 1892, while the Education Act of 1902 was producing altogether unforeseen consequences, and would have to be altered from top to bottom. But every one of these cases must be considered on its merits. The Prime Minister had not based his case on the usual grounds at all; in fact his speech dealt with so many matters that it alone in the olden days would have afforded matter for six or seven days discussion. He had referred to the Budget, for instance, as uncontroversial. There never was a year in which the Budget required to be more closely scrutinised; and it was not at all certain that it had escaped the taint of recent fiscal controversies.

The right hon. Gentleman had admitted in specific terms that his Motion did contract the liberties of the House and had argued that if it were not passed the House of Commons would become a wholly impotent Assembly. A bad workman always complained of his tools. Never had any Leader of the House less reason to complain of the forms of procedure or of the conduct of the Opposition than the present Prime Minister. There had been so many alterations in the Standing Orders that Members sometimes hardly knew where they were. The whole aim of those alterations had been to fetter Members and fritter away the control of the House of Commons over the executive Government. He wondered sometimes what was the idea of the supporters of the Government of the House of Commons? Did they really regard it as a deliberative Assembly? One would fancy that their only idea of their duties was to come down and register the decrees of the Government without debate, without question, without consideration. One hon. Member actually asked the other day whether it was in order to attack a Cabinet Minister. Good heavens! What were Ministers there for but to be criticised and attacked? The enormous change that had taken place in the relation of the House of Commons to the Government of the day even in his own time could hardly be imagined. Up to quite recently, for instance, the Government had, by Standing Orders, only control of two out of every five hours during which the House sat. It was now, so far as the other side of the House was concerned, simply a machine to register the decrees and wishes of the Government. It was a striking fact that in the days when the greatest legislation was passed through Parliament the Government had the least control of the time of the House. Now, although he had remodelled the Rules and had a large majority at his back, impatient of debate and quite ready to vote for anything, the right hon. Gentleman came forward and confessed himself impotent. The House would never perform its proper function until it adopted some well-matured system of devolution and delegation of its powers. Where the Prime Minister had erred was that in the general conduct of the business of the House, and more especially during the present session, he had failed to recognise that the House of Commons, after all, had in it a great deal of human nature He relied too much upon rules and the particular hour of the clock. That was contrary to the old spirit of the proceedings in the House of Commons. Anyone who took up the Standing Orders of the House would at once see the nature of the Prime Minister's management of the business. Standing Order No. 18 was still unfinished, and in its present form it was unmitigated nonsense and a positive discredit to the Government. But it marked in a most striking way the slatternly way in which the business was conducted by the right hon. Gentleman. During two or three days before Easter the House hardly knew what it was going to do. The House sat for forty-seven days before the Licensing Bill was introduced; sixty-four days of the session elapsed before the Second Reading was taken, and seventy-four days passed before the Committee stage was reached. No instance could be given of so much time being allowed to run by before a first-class Government measure was introduced and dealt with. Constant alterations and postponements and substitutions had taken place, and in regard to the whole conduct of the business of the House there had been a chopping and changing annoying to the last degree to hon. Members who desired to discharge their Parliamentary duties conscientiously. They all knew that the reason for all this was that the Government could not make up their minds until the last moment.

As to the conduct of the Licensing Bill, he did not think the Prime Minister had been quite fair to the Home Secretary, who had been given three hours hard labour upstairs for three days a week upon another measure which he would never carry—the Aliens Bill. With regard to the part taken by the Solicitor-General in the discussions upon this Bill, the right hon. Gentleman was not an Englishman, and they ought to have had representing the Government somebody who had been *au courant* with the current of temperance reform in this country. In his opinion the First Lord of the Treasury committed a solecism and an offence against the House by coming in late during the discussion on Wednesday last and putting his foot down upon a common agreement which had almost been arrived at on both sides of the House. When this interference took place, the debate had been conducted with terse argumentative speeches which manifested a real desire to get at the root of the matter, and that was the state of things last Wednesday when the Prime Minister hurried in and put his foot down upon the whole thing. The flourishing of these sixty-five pages of, Amendments by the Prime Minister was a little unworthy of him, because hon. Members knew that these Amendments vanished like snow when the governing principles had been disposed of, and many of the Amendments were duplicates. But they had had something else this session besides the general mismanagement and nonchalance of the Prime Minister, for there had been a certain slackness in attendance on this and other Bills of hon. Gentleman opposite. [MINISTERIAL cries of "No, no!"] Upon what, however, did the authority of the House rest? Surely the representative principle. From that point of view the authority of the Government was slipping away. The *Standard* of that morning said, referring to the Sowerby election—

> "The figures are disappointing. The lesson is unmistakable. It testifies beyond all reasonable doubt to the unwelcome truth that the Government have lost and continue to lose ground throughout the country."

He put it to the right hon. Gentleman whether the time had not almost arrived when self-respecting men ought no longer to refrain from taking the judgment of the country. Knowing as he did that individually those sitting on the Treasury Bench were honourable English gentlemen he was astonished that collectively they could remain Ministers for a single moment after the evidence of by-elections——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member is going a little too far in discussing the general position of the attitude of the Government with regard to all these measures.

*MR. JOHN ELLIS said the petitions presented to the House testified to the overwhelming opinion of the country against the Bill. Meetings of opponents of the measure had been held all over the country; but it had been found impossible to get a meeting in its favour. There was this volume of opinion against the Bill because it was perceived by those great social and religious elements which existed in our midst, and were the salvation and life of this country, that this Bill struck against moral and social reform. The great army of workers in those causes were to a man opposed to the Bill. He listened with pain to the callous words which the Prime Minister let fall about those who suffered from this great evil, "those people are ruined by their gross and criminal indulgence." The Prime Minister had no pity for the drunkard, or word of sympathy for the widow and orphan. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh!"] From the Treasury Bench the word justice was applied solely to a particular trade, and not in any way to its fruits or its victims. What was to his mind the most shocking and astounding element of the whole situation was that that Bill marked the high-water mark of that era of materialism upon which we had entered. It was because the people were a God-fearing people [MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh" and "Order!"], that with a sure instinct they had perceived the real tendency of this Bill. It was because—giving credit to every hon. Member opposite for holding the opposite opinion with sincerity—he was satisfied the Resolution was brought in and pressed on with a view of passing an evil measure, that it would meet with his unmitigated opposition. Hon. Members opposite might rest assured that the Opposition repudiated this Bill from top to bottom, and if it was carried, especially in the way proposed, they washed their hands of it, and on the first opportunity that came to them, and come it would, sooner or later—and he earnestly hoped sooner—this Bill would be effaced from the Statute-book.

*MR. TRITTON (Lambeth, Norwood) said he would not attempt to follow the last speaker beyond thanking him for the lesson he had read to hon. Members on that side, which no doubt would be most thankfully received by all the Members of the Party, as to the slackness of their attendance in the debates. He ventured to hope that those remarks would lead to what no doubt the hon. Member intended, namely, better attendance in future. He wished to make a personal statement, instead of giving a silent vote on this question, which he regarded as one of very great magnitude. It was a question in which he was most deeply interested. He was one of those who had not voted for the Second Reading of the Bill. He was one of those who voted against the Government and in favour of a fourteen years time limit, because he believed with all his heart that a time limit was most necessary in this Bill. He objected to the turning of a licence into a vested interest. He had voted on several other occasions against the Government, and he supposed that before the end of the chapter he would find occasion to do so again. Holding these views, it had been his determination to vote against the Resolution now before the House. Things had occurred which had completely altered that determination, and the thing that weighed with him more than anything else was the speech which was delivered earlier in this discussion by the hon. Member for the Spen Valley Division. The hon. Member was regarded, and rightly regarded, as one of the leaders of the temperance party; he had long been a standard bearer; and he had done most excellent work in the temperance cause throughout the country. The hon. Member was invaluable on the Royal Commission, and having enjoyed his personal friendship for many years he would understand that if he said anything adverse about him he said it with great reluctance. He hoped he would say nothing that would cause the hon. Member any pain. He confessed that when he heard the speech of the hon. Member he was filled with more indignation than he had ever felt on any subject during the twelve years he had been a Member of this House. He ventured to say that that speech was unworthy of the hon. Member. It was unlike his own self. He thought the hon. Member had been carried away by those about him and led to say rather more than he was inclined to say. He thought that speech had done harm to the temperance cause. He did not think the temperance cause was advanced by intemperate language, and the attack on the Prime Minister was one which would be resented by many temperance people throughout the country. He wished the hon. Member to understand what the effect of that speech had been on him. It would lead him not to vote with the hon. Member in the lobby into which he would go, but in the Government lobby. There was no statesman living or dead who had ever sat on the front bench who had done so much for the temperance cause as the Prime Minister. [Laughter.] Hon. Members might laugh, but would they tell him who was the statesman? He called for an answer. Would they tell him who the statesman was There was an Act now on the Statute-book of this country which had done, was doing, and in future would do, an enormous amount of good to save the rising generation from the evils of strong drink. How did that Bill get through. He thought he had as good a right to speak on this subject as any one else. It never would have got through but for the Prime Minister who gave facilities for its being passed. It was to the credit of the Prime Minister that that Bill was passed—a Bill which was doing so much good for the children of the land. Who brought in the Licensing Bill of 1902? Who brought in the Scotch Licensing Bill of 1903? Hon. Members opposite had not told him who had done more than the present occupants of the Treasury Bench for the cause of temperance. He challenged hon. Members to say who had done more in that cause than the right hon. Gentleman. He was sorry the right hon. Gentleman was not in his place at the present moment because he was going to make an earnest appeal to him. He himself thought it was premature to bring forward the Resolution now before the House. He thought the Prime Minister had not given sufficient time for the discussion of this most important measure. Great issues were dependent upon it. He was going to ask the Prime Minister, if not too late now, to be a little more generous and to give a few more days for the Committee stage and the report stage. There were many hon. Members on the Government side of the House who would agree with him when he said that they had been treated in a niggardly way. The Prime Minister might have given them more time for the discussion of the measure. He had thought it right to state the reasons which had led him to support the Resolution and to dissociate himself entirely from the attack on the Prime Minister. In making this protest as a temperance man and a moderate speaker he thought he had not in any way departed from the courtesies of debate.

*MR. MOULTON (Cornwall, Launceston) said he hoped the House would not suppose he was the less hearty in his support of the Amendment if he began his remarks by saying that he thought in this matter every Member of the House was now not in a Party but in a judicial position. They were not discussing what legislation was to be. They were discussing what the privileges of the House for discussing legislation were to be. He had before pointed out that the Rules of the House which govern procedure were Rules to protect the weak. They were like the Rules of a game. It should be a matter of honour with each individual Member not to interfere with the sanctity of those rules which were to protect him when he was in a minority. In this case there were only two questions to be considered. The first was raised by the tone of the Prime Minister in bringing this Resolution before the House. The right hon. Gentleman brought it forward in a way which intimated that he looked upon this form of closure as an ordinary feature of Parliamentary procedure, and having said that there was but a short time left of the session, he sat down with the air of one who had said enough to justify his proposal without giving any grounds based upon the nature of the Bill, or the seriousness of the occasion, for using this particular remedy. This raised the first question on which they had to decide, viz.—"Are we going to admit closure by compartments as an ordinary Parliamentary procedure, to be used by the Leader of the majority of the House as and when he pleased? If they were prepared to do this let it be done, but do not let the present majority do it in respect of particular measures before it was made the Rule of the House. If they abused their power in this respect they were in this dilemma: either the other side would retaliate, and Parliamentary procedure would be thereby lowered, or the other side would not retaliate because they had a keener sense of Parliamentary honour than those who now formed the majority. He thought that hon. Members on the other side would feel that each of these alternatives was one that they did not willingly associate themselves with.

He would consider for a moment whether it would be desirable to make closure by compartments a part of ordinary Parliamentary procedure. It was a necessary part of our procedure in Committee that Amendments should be taken in strict verbal order and that during the discussion upon each Amendment speakers should be confined to that which was thus before the House, and should be forbidden to refer to subsequent Amendments even though they were far more important. It followed that if the total length of the discussion were fixed, the necessary discussion on the earlier Amendments left the later ones without the possibility of any debate or criticism. A Minister could thus by the use of closure by compartments shield any portion of the machinery of a Bill from open criticism on the floor of the House. They were not allowed to discuss the details of a Bill when they were discussing the Second Reading. This was natural because a roving discussion of the details of a Bill would lessen the value of the debate on its principle. Yet they were going to allow a Minister so to mould the time for point by point criticism of the Bill that much of it would pass without being examined at all. It made it a matter of haphazard what was to be discussed at all, and a Minister would be enabled to shield what might be most important in the machinery entirely from Parliamentary criticism. Let him give an example from the Bill. So far as the broad principle of the Bill was concerned to establish compensation by equalising the loss of a licence over the trade, he thought that principle had supporters on both sides of the House. But it was the way in which it was done, and still more the indirect consequences of the machinery by which it was done that made it a cloak for largely increasing the value of the licensed houses, and handing over this huge property to the brewers and the licence-holders. It was that which they, on that side of the House, most strongly opposed; because they felt that it would cripple the cause of temperance in the future. This great evil lurked in what might be called the detailed arrangement of the Bill—the objects of the Bill—and not in the principle of giving compensation from the trade. They believed that these so called details were the main object of the Bill, and that so far as the aims of its authors were concerned the Bill would become more valuable for the object in view if everything connected with the machinery broke down.

The second question was whether, if the procedure was to remain an exceptional one the present Bill was an occasion when it should be resorted to. He had listened to nine-tenths of the debate, nad he had not heard a shadow of a case made out for applying this procedure in the case of this particular Bill. The only argument of the Prime Minister was that six and a half months was the full Parliamentary time at the disposal of the House; but did the Prime Minister say that it was a hard and fast necessity that the House should rise on the 9th or 12th August, and that they could not sit for a week later to discuss the machinery of a Bill on which the whole licensing system of England depended? Was that consideration to override all public welfare? This was not a case like that of the Home Rule Bill, when over eighty days were taken up with discussion; but only a question of a week or a fortnight more—which short period would not have been required if there had been a proper economy of Parliamentary time at the beginning of the session. Could it be suggested that the House must necessarily rise in the beginning of August? If so, that was a short and easy method for getting important Bills through without discussion. The Government might introduce at the beginning of the session Dog Bills and other petty measures, and put off their more important Bills till a late period of the Parliamentary year, and then say that there was to be no detailed criticism of them. This surrender of the rights of criticism and discussion by the whole House was not in the interest even of the Bills brought forward by the Government themselves. It deprived them of all moral claim to respect by subsequent Parliaments. And it was in truth the individual members of the Party who were the cause of such steps being taken. Their disapproval would prevent the Government having resource to such measures. He knew the humorous exaggeration of the hon. Member for North Armagh, who said that he was sent there to keep the Unionist Government in power, whether they were right or wrong—that that was all his duty. They knew perfectly well that the hon. and gallant Member did not really mean that he felt himself free to act otherwise than honourably, but the profession of such sentiments weakened the moral hold which the members of the Party had on the Government, and which might have prevented this Motion ever being brought forward. What he claimed was, that the Government should know that a Motion like this, unless justified in the eyes of an impartial tribunal, would not receive favour from even the right hon. Gentleman's own side. He was sure there never was a Bill more stamped with all that should make hon. Members shrink from shielding it from public criticism. It was professedly a Bill to alter the existing state of things in favour of a private body of people. Beyond question these licences had been granted under safeguards which were now proposed to be removed. Speaker after speaker had admitted that the existence of the present powers of the licensing magistrates had greatly diminished the value of the licences.

* **MR. SPEAKER**: The hon. and learned Member is now discussing the merits of the Bill.

***MR. MOULTON** said he only meant to demonstrate that this was a type of Bill which ought not to be dealt with in the manner proposed by the Resolution of the Prime Minister. He would begin at the other end. What circumstances would warrant such a procedure? If a Bill was of an urgent character, if it was one on which public order depended, and the time at the disposal of the House would not suffice for its minute criticism, it might be necessary that Parliament should say "We should rather have it in the rough than not at all." But no such circumstances existed here. Deliberate misconduct or obstruction on the part of the Opposition Party, paralysing by means of the forms of the House the realities which underlay those forms, might give a moral justification for applying the drastic Motion proposed by the Prime Minister. But he thought it was conceded by everybody that there had been no obstruction. The Prime Minister would not suggest that there had been obstruction. If he had suggested it the evidence of those who had been present throughout the debates would have pointed to a very different verdict. Nobody pretended that there had been obstruction. So that there was no justification for the closure on that ground. There might be other imaginable causes for such a Motion. A strong mandate might have been given from the country; the House might have been elected *ad hoc* to pass a particular Bill, and if there was delay in passing the measure it might have been said that the House was culpable because they were over-riding the wishes of the people. But he would ask the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister if he could say, in his heart, that he was voicing the opinion of the country? If the right hon. Gentleman were to look at the question impartially, he would be obliged to admit that the country had repeatedly, by the results of recent elections, and by every method by which it could express its opinion, shown that it was against this change. Again, the character of this Bill was such that the Government ought itself to shrink from applying this Motion. It was unquestionably a Bill in favour of a great organisation—probably the most powerful—of the supporters of the Government. He did not for a moment say that devotion to temperance was confined to that side of the House. He believed that some of the most ardent workers in the temperance cause were to be found on the Ministerial Benches. But there were two facts to which they could not shut their eyes. One was, that the curse of England was drink; and the other was, that the main support of the Unionist Party was the drink trade. This Bill was a Bill in favour of that great and powerful body. He asked every hon. Member opposite who was in favour of temperance reform to examine themselves closely, and see whether by the proposal of the Prime Minister the desire was not only to support Party ends, but to deprive them, as well as the Opposition, of the rights and privileges of Parliament. He was sure that if this House were going to maintain its liberties, dignity, and authority on questions of procedure, hon. Gentlemen opposite must tell their leaders that they ought not to allow the use of their majority to prevent the full examination of measures brought before the House and thus to override the rights of the minority.

SIR CARNE RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford) said he had some sympathy with the hon. Member for the Spen Valley and other hon. Gentlemen opposite who desired to make drunken people sober by keeping sober people thirsty. He, however, regretted that the Prime Minister had had to closure this interesting Bill by compartments. Hon. Members on both sides, however, had brought that state of things on themselves. They could not have it both ways. If they spoke in an unlimited fashion on every subject under the sun from February to June, they could hardly expect to luxuriate in long speeches from June to August. It all arose from long speeches. To use an ordinary simile, it was impossible to put a quart into a pint pot. It was because speeches were so inordinately long that the present state of affairs had arisen. He had been in constant attendance at the House during the discussion on the Licensing Bill He did not trouble the House with any trivial views of his own, but he might say now that he did not think that the long speeches which had been delivered were entirely the fault of hon. Members. He noticed in connection with this particular Bill that when an hon. Gentleman spoke for ten minutes, he found next morning that the newspapers said, "After a few remarks from Mr. A—" or perhaps his name was omitted altogether. On the other hand, an hon. Gentleman who spoke for fifty or sixty minutes and said everything that every one else had already said, found himself credited with three-quarters of a column. Mr. A's constitutents might say they would have to get rid of him and the result was that he spoke longer, whereas Mr. B's speeches never came to an end. With reference to the matter under discussion he would venture to say that the only reason why the Prime Minister was obliged to apply a leaf out of Mr. Gladstone's book to this interesting Bill was on account of long speeches.

*Mr. J. H. **LEWIS** (Flint Boroughs) said that there was one aspect of the question which had not yet received attention. He wished to refer to the way in which the Principality of Wales was to be treated. The question whether Wales was to be included or excluded would in the ordinary way be discussed on Clause 9; but it would be impossible that the clause could be discussed if the Motion were carried. Before Clause 9 could be considered a number of varied and important questions would have to be discussed. Where, therefore, could the Welsh Members have an opportunity of urging that Wales should be excluded from the operation of the Act. A great deal had been said during the discussions on the Bill as to a mandate for it not being given in the case of England. No such question could possibly arise in the case of Wales. For thirty-six years Wales had given overwhelming majorities in favour of temperance legislation. The present Bill was a death blow to temperance in Wales. He appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to give the Welsh Members some opportunity of discussing this question. When any great contentious measure was brought forward the application of the Bill to Wales was always put in the last clause, and it was impossible for the Welsh Members to properly discuss the propriety of excluding Wales from the scope of the Bill when closure by compartments was applied. Wales had a special and exceptional position in this matter. It had been dealt with exceptionally by Parliament as regards temperance reform. When the Welsh Local Veto Bill was before the House of Commons it was remarkable that twenty-five Welsh Members voted for it and only one against it. That was an indication of the position of Wales in regard to this great question. Therefore, it would be wise for the right hon. Gentleman to give an opportunity to the Welsh Members to discuss whether Wales should or should not be excluded. The right hon. Gentleman refused that in the case of the Education Bill, and the result was that he now had to bring in a coercion Bill. This trampling on a small nationality really did not pay the Government in the end. Wales was a small country, but it had a right to be heard on this question, which vitally affected its well-being.

*Sir J. STIRLING-MAXWELL (Glasgow, College) said the arguments of hon. Gentlemen opposite made it very difficult to agree with their conclusions, yet, although he was a friend of the Government and of the Bill, he did agree with them to a large extent. He ventured to think that his right hon. friend the Prime Minister had not made out a case for the application of the closure procedure at this particular stage of the discussion. He understood the argument for the Motion was that the Bill dealt with a very limited issue, that its main subject had been amply discussed on First and Second Reading, and that the enormous mass of Amendments before the House either attacked again the main principle of the Bill or else attempted to introduce changes of the general law which it was not advisable or convenient to make at present. He thought that would be a good case for applying the closure, even at such an early stage of the debate, but he did not think an impartial examinations of those dreadful sixty-five pages of Amendments would lead to the conclusion that such an argument applied. The application of a scheme of compensation to our existing licensing law was a very difficult matter, and he did not wonder that a great many suggestions had been made in matters of detail, some of which had already been adopted or met by the Solicitor-General, who had conducted the debate with such marked skill and good humour. He thought the greater part of the Amendments dealt with important matters, and were directed against the introduction into the general law of a very important constitutional change. It seemed more than doubtful whether the authors of the Bill had really intended it to effect such a change. To many of them who were interested in the question of temperance reform it appeared that the change which limited the discretion of the magistrates as to a renewal of licence would really give away what he might call the key of the position of temperance reform. They thought it almost a matter of conscience that this important question should be debated fairly, and he appealed to his right hon. friend to extend the limit of time allowed to the Bill so that such important questions as this might receive adequate discussion.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid.) said that he did not think that the suggestion made by the right hon. Baronet would meet the views of the House. What he proposed to ask the House was this, if this Resolution were carried, could the Bill be properly discussed? He cared very little for precedents in this matter, and less for opinions of the occupants of the Treasury Bench in past years and past Governments. The only question which, in his opinion, the House ought to have in view, in considering the proposals of the Prime Minister, was whether or not, having regard to the particular Bill before the House, it could, if this Resolution were carried, be adequately and properly discussed. He had great sympathy with Governments who had but little time to carry through their business, but on this occasion his sympathy was not so great, because they were now near the end of a session in which the time had been muddled away from the commencement. He quite admitted that the Parliamentary machine was not at present efficient. No business could be carried on satisfactorily by the 670 Members of Parliament under the present procedure, and it was a very great pity, in his opinion, that the rules could not be amended in such a way as to enable Bills which had reached a certain stage to be carried over from one session of Parliament to the next, if within the ordinary limits of the session the Bill could not be adequately and properly discussed. He had listened with sorrow to the speech of the hon. Member for Norwood, who had the cause of temperance so much at heart. Everyone who had listened to temperance matters in this House would agree that the contributions of the hon. Member for Norwood had been of the most excellent kind. His speeches, always short, were among the most eloquent heard in the House, and it was with pain and regret that he heard the hon. Member get up and say that he was going to vote for this proposal because it was resisted by the Opposition. So far as the speech of the hon. Member for the Spen Valley was concerned, he would say nothing whatever about it, except that he agreed with every word that the hon. Member had said.

So far as the conduct of the Bill was concerned, he would say nothing about the Home Secretary, except that the right hon. Gentleman had not had much experience in conducting Bills through the House, that he did not trouble the House very much, and only occasionally read something which had been written down for him, or which he had written down himself. But no Bill had ever been conducted better than this, when the hon. and learned Gentleman the Solicitor-General was left in charge of it. He disagreed with one of his hon. friends who had stated that an Irishman ought not to be in charge of the Bill. The right hon. and learned Gentleman opposite was Solicitor-General for England, and even if, at the beginning of the discussion, he was not acquainted with the details of the English licensing system, he had shown that he could conduct the Bill moderately, sensibly, and with good humour. If the Solicitor-General had been given *carte blanche* to listen to the speeches and consider the Amendments, he could have got the Bill through Committee, and it would have emerged from the ordeal in such a shape as to have commanded, at any rate, some respect in the eyes of the country. The Bill really required to be more fully discussed than an ordinary measure. Its source of origin was the brewers. Almost every reforming agency in the country disagreed with its proposals. The Prime Minister had declared the Bill to be in the interests of "eternal justice." The Bishops, clergy, and ministers of all denominations were supposed to know something about justice—they certainly dealt in matters affecting eternity—and when the two elements were combined in eternal justice, surely the opinion of the Bishops and clergy, which was against the Bill, ought to carry some weight. But the right hon. Gentleman practically told the Bishops to stick to their lasts, to wear their own aprons, or whatever the proper phrase might be. Moreover, the medical profession, who were concerned mainly with the physique of the country, had through some of their most eminent representatives declared against the Bill. The working of the measure depended absolutely upon the details of the scheme, and it was essential that those details should be perfected as far as possible by the combined wisdom and intelligence of the House. It was impossible for even a single Amendment to be considered satisfactorily in the time allotted to the Bill, and consequently the measure would not be properly discussed at all. If the procedure of the House was to be altered in any way, it should be done by a Resolution applying to the whole of the business. The Committee stage was the most essential stage in connection with such a measure as the Licensing Bill. It was a pity that on the Committee stage of such Bills there was not fuller freedom from Party ties. Many Members on the other side would be glad to vote on the questions affected without being driven by the crack of the Party whip.

*MR. SPEAKER intimated that the remarks of the hon. Member hardly applied to the Motion before the House.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS admitted that he had wandered somewhat from his general argument. The question was of the greatest importance from the Parliamentary point of view, and he would be only too delighted if something could be done to carry the business through. It was the business of Parliament to do work. Hon. Members who had considered the matter must have been astounded at the waste of time in the House. The present proposal, however, would not save time. Apparently they could not get anything done until they began to waste time, but it was not by spasmodic changes of this kind that the dignity of the House of Commons would be upheld. He objected to the Licensing Bill, and therefore objected to the proposals to hurry the Bill through. The Motion would form a very bad precedent to future Governments, who would take advantage of it to transact the business of the country improperly.

SIR JOHN KENNAWAY (Devonshire, Honiton) freely admitted it was a Party measure most keenly contested, and as such must be dealt with and carried through. It had been said that the Bishops and clergy were totally opposed to the Bill, but the fact was that the Bishops had passed a resolution strongly in favour of a time limit. His idea of a time limit was that there should be some time at which the Bill should be reconsidered and Parliament have an opportunity of again pronouncing an opinion upon it. It was not fair, therefore, to say that the Bishops and clergy were opposed to the Bill as a whole. But there were many chairmen of quarter sessions who had spoken strongly in favour of the Bill, because they believed the principle on which it was based was a right one. He admitted fully that it ought to be discussed, because there were many points on which it deserved consideration and he would strongly join in the appeal to the Government to enlarge the time for discussion. He should like to have an assurance from the Government that they would fairly consider Amendments to be submitted from either side. It was not to their interests to have a Bill forced through the House, and if it were it would be opposed to the moral sense of the country. The House, however, should be master of its own business, and ought not to allow itself to become a laughing-stock in the country. The country expected the House of Commons to do business, and he thought with the Prime Minister, they ought to bring their business within moderate limits. If the Government would grant a little more time, he did not despair of the Bill being fairly well discussed. There were still three stages of the Bill to go through and they had no right to assume that the discussion would be of a perfunctory character. A good deal of time had been wasted this session, and if three or four weeks discussion were allowed on the Committee stage of this Bill, the only effect would be that other important measures would have to be rushed through next month. He should vote for the Resolution, but hoped the Government would be ready to listen to a fair consideration of the Amendments.

*MR. BARLOW (Somersetshire, Frome) said that he should not have intervened in this debate but for the fact that he considered the course which the Government had adopted in regard to the Licensing Bill was a very serious one, not merely in connection with that measure, but also for the future well-being, and indeed the authority, of Parliament. He did not see how the Government could expect the country to give that assent and support which was supposed to be given to the measures passed by the House of Commons to a measure which was passed under the operation of the closure after such a very short and wholly inadequate time had been allowed for the discussion of the measure; and action of this kind prevented the House of Commons from being the master of its own business, and utterly took away from it the power of shaping its measures. It was the duty of the Government, not only to get measures through, but to afford the House of Commons adequate time and opportunities to discuss, at any rate, the leading features and provisions of this and other Bills. If the Resolution before the House were adopted, he did not think anyone could say that the House had been afforded an adequate opportunity of looking into the most important parts of the Bill. It was all the more important that the House should have an adequate opportunity to examine this measure closely, because the subject was a thorny and difficult one, which had been considered by a Royal Commission. When the Government brought in a Bill which was not in accordance with the recommendations made, either by the minority or the majority Reports of Lord Peel's Commission, they ought to be specially careful to give the House of Commons time to examine the provisions of the measure, and to see the reasons why they had not carried out the suggestions made. He had listened with very great interest to-day and on Friday to the speeches which had been made on both sides of the House. The hon. Member for Altrincham had said that he would vote for the proposal of the Government, though he admitted that he would do so with great uneasiness, because he thought the closure was a detestable action. That was very strong language for a supporter of the Government to use about their action. Other Members had suggested that if the Government could not see their way to give up this proposal they would, at any rate, give the House rather more time to examine the Bill than they proposed to do at present. Many such suggestions had come from the Government side of the House, and he hoped that those suggestions would lead to a modification of the proposals of the Government. The Bill was one which required careful examination. It dealt with very important matters affecting the social life of the people of this country, and he was certain it could be—and he spoke in this way in no Party sense — very materially improved by adequate and reasonable discussion across the floor of the House. Some improvements had already been made, but most important parts of the Bill were as yet unreached. It had been said that the measure was not submitted to the country, and from that point of view, he thought the Government ought to give full and ample time in the Committee stage to see if the Bill could not be made a more workable and reasonable measure than it was now. The discussion on the Opposition side of the House had not been obstructive. If there had been any obstructive discussion it had been on the Government side of the House directly after the interval allowed for dinner. That was the only time when any acute observer could detect obstruction. On the Opposition side of the House they had endeavoured to discuss the Bill fairly and reasonably, with the idea of making it a more workable and better measure. He thought that if measures of this kind were to be subjected to closure by compartments in the way proposed by the Government, when they had been so briefly discussed as this Bill had been, it would be a bad day for the country, for the House of Commons, and for constitutional government in this country.

*MR. MARSHALL HALL (Lancashire, Southport) said an appeal had been made by the hon. and learned Member for the Launceston Division to the Ministerialists to consider this matter in a judical spirit, and it was because he was anxious to do so that he had determined to support the Government, as he did not think any private feeling of his own ought to interfere with his judicial duty. He was personally against this proposal, and so far as he could, would resist any interference with the rights and liberties of the House of Commons. It was a great pity that a Bill of the magnitude of the Licensing Bill should be rushed through the House, but he was in this far more serious difficulty. He believed that the Bill as framed and when carried would be in aid of temperance, and he yielded to no man in his anxiety to see the cause of temperance advanced. He also believed that this Bill would do another thing. It would remove the possibility of a grave injustice being done to a trade which had not deserved that injustice should be done to it. If he was right in that, the difficulty which presented itself to his mind was this, Was this Bill to be passed or not? If he could take seriously the protestations of his hon. friends opposite that they really wished the Bill to be fairly discussed and passed if a proper measure, he might take another view in regard to the Resolution; but he regretted to say that he was afraid that the anxiety of his hon. friends opposite was that the Bill should not be passed in any form or state whatever. He had only to listen to the passionate invective of the hon. Member for Spen Valley to find what was the Opposition feeling in regard to this particular Bill. When he listened to the impertinent buffoonery of the hon. Member for Northampton [OPPOSITION cries of "Oh!" and "Withdraw"]—he felt it was a deliberate—[Renewed cries of "Withdraw."]

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member must not use discourteous language of another Member.

*MR. MARSHALL HALL :I withdraw it, but if the hon. Member were here I do not think he would wish it withdrawn, for this reason—I think the hon. Member for Northampton takes pleasure in turning to ridicule matters before the House. [Cries of "Withdraw."]

*MR. SPEAKER said the hon. Member had withdrawn the words.

*MR. MARSHALL HALL said he withdrew unreservedly and at once any expression he ought not to use, as he thought any hon. Member would do. He looked upon the speech of the hon. Member for Northampton as a waste of time. In saying that he hoped he might be within the limits of Parliamentary etiquette. The hon. Member was apt, and took great delight in turning into ridicule matters which did not always seem to be subjects for ridicule; and these speeches showed him that there was a wish on the other side of the House that this Bill should not become law. Therefore they came face to face with two alternatives—either this Bill must pass or fail. If it was to be passed it seemed to him that after the speech of the Prime Minister the only way it could be passed was by the application of closure by compartments. If this was to be applied he joined with his hon friends who had just spoken, the two hon. Baronets below the gangway, who had asked that more time should be given to the discussion of the two great principles involved. He would like more time given to the consideration of the ultimate destination of the compensation and the allocation of it; and he would like to see the rights of the actual licence-holders protected beyond any possibility of their being taken from them. To say that this was a brewers' measure entirely was not a just criticism of the Bill. It was not right to say that this Bill was dictated by the brewers. It was a Bill required by the public and by the whole of the licensed trade in the interests of temperance. He asked that the interests of the servants of the brewers and of the public in this matter should be safeguarded, and that ample opportunity would be given to discuss the rights that they had under this Bill. He said again that this was a measure in favour of temperance, and he spoke with some knowledge. He had had as much experience, if not more, than a great many hon. Members in regard to the working of the Licensing Acts of this country, and he said without fear of contradiction that many benches of magistrates had refrained from taking away licences which otherwise they would have taken away, and thereby reduced the number of licences, because they felt that they could not do so without the risk of doing an injustice, and they thought that the lesser of two evils was the better to choose on those particular occasions.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member is discussing the merits of the Bill and not the Motion.

*MR. MARSHALL HALL said he had not meant to say more than that it was a temperance measure, and he regretted that he had been tempted to go beyond that and to give the reasons for thinking that it was a temperance measure. The Bill was one which the majority of the House wanted to see carried. It was a Bill of the greatest importance, and if hon. Gentlemen were to go to the country upon the Bill, he had very little doubt that the voice of the country would be in favour of it. The question was whether they were to subordinate the wishes of the majority to the prejudices of the minority.

There was only one other topic he wished to discuss, and that was that the opportunity seemed to have been taken by the somewhat intemperate advocates of temperance outside the House of Commons to make the passing of this Resolution a vehicle for threats against individual Members of the House. He himself had been the recipient of letter after letter from persons threatening to do all in their power to make others vote against him night and day if he supported this Resolution. He knew whence that class of letters came, and he knew how to treat them. But if one thing would induce him to do his best to support the Government in this matter it would be the threat that any private injury could occur to himself for doing what he believed it to be his honourable duty to do on this occasion. He had no wish to trespass on the time of the House any longer, and he regretted that in almost his first speech in the House he should have been betrayed into using an expression with regard to the hon. Member for Northampton, which was unparliamentary and which he had withdrawn. He felt very strongly on this subject, and he regretted the action which was generally taken by a section of the temperance party on this question. He maintained that hon. Members on the Ministerial side of the House were just as keenly interested in temperance as his hon. friends opposite; and it was because he was an advocate of temperance, and because he honestly believed that the Bill would do good, and because he believed that the Resolution under discussion was the only way in which this Bill could be passed into law, that he would give his vote for the Prime Minister's Motion, and take the consequences, whatever they might be to himself.

*MR. HELME (Lancashire, Lancaster) said that it was because of the strength of the feeling that the necessity of the case demanded a more careful consideration of this Bill than could be given to it if the House assented to the proposal of the Prime Minister, that he entered his most emphatic protest against it. So far as could be judged from the expressions of opinion that had come from their constituencies hon. Members on each side of the House were face to face with evidence, that could not be disputed, that the country agreed that the House could not give proper consideration to this Bill under the time limit proposed by the Prime Minister. The public regarded this proposal as a question whether the trade should control the State or the State control the trade, and, further, they were justified in opposing the Motion to the best of their ability on the ground that it would degrade the proceedings of Parliament. As the Bill now stood it was entirely subversive of the best interests of the country in connection with a most important question, and why should the Government say that the Committee stage should be curtailed? During the discussions in Committee it had been discovered that the powers of the magistrates had been so greatly impaired as to upset the conceptions of the people in regard to the Bill when it was first introduced. If ever more deliberation was required for any Bill it was justified in this case, because most important concessions had been made by the Government. One was that a licence to be given in future should not come within the scope of the compensation clause of this measure, and just when they were dealing with the question of magisterial control the Prime Minister stopped discussion suddenly by this drastic proposal. The Government should be prepared to consider the equities of the case. The Government claimed that they represented the opinion of the country, but all the evidence was against that assertion, and even among their own supporters it was admitted that there was an increasing volume of popular opinion against the proposals in the Bill. That being the case the Prime Minister had no right to hurry the Bill through the House in the way he was doing. It was not true that any national interest was at stake if this Bill did not pass. It touched one of the greatest interests in another direction—the sobriety of the people. The national supremacy of this nation depended upon the skill of its workmen, and that, again, depended on the sobriety of the hands engaged in industry; effort in handicraft was paralysed if the brain was not clear from the influence of drink, but there were higher interests than commercial ones. Therefore, in opposing the forcing of this Bill through the House by closure, they were serving the highest and noblest interests of the country as well as endeavouring to preserve the constitutional liberties and privileges of this House. The mere fact that 171 Amendments had been put down by Members on the Government Benches showed that there was much room to improve the measure.

And, it being half-past Seven of the Clock, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

LICENSING BILL (PROCEDURE).

Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Amendment to Question [1st July], "That the proceedings in Committee and on Report of the Licensing Bill shall be brought to a conclusion in the manner hereinafter mentioned on six allotted days:

(a) The proceedings in Committee on Clause 1 on the first allotted day.

(b) The proceedings in Committee on Clauses 2 and 3 on the second allotted day.

(c) The proceedings in Committee on Clause 4 on the third allotted day.

(d) The proceedings in Committee on the remaining clauses of the Bill, and on any new Government clauses, and on schedules and any new Government schedules, and any other proceedings necessary to bring the Committee stage to a conclusion on the fourth allotted day.

(e) The proceedings on Report on any new clauses and on Amendments to Clauses 1, 2, and 3 of that Bill, be brought to a conclusion on the fifth allotted day, and

(f) The proceedings on Report be concluded on the sixth allotted day.

After this Order comes into operation, any day shall be considered an allotted day for the purposes of this Order on which the Licensing Bill is put down as the first Order of the Day.

At 11 p.m. on the said allotted days, or if the day is a Friday at 4.30 p.m., the Chairman or Speaker shall put forthwith the Question or Questions on any Amendment or Motion already proposed from the Chair, and shall next proceed successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments moved by the Government of which notice has been given (but no other Amendments) and on every Question necessary to dispose of the allotted business to be concluded on the allotted day.

In the case of Government Amendments or of Government new clauses or schedules, he shall put only the Question that the Amendment be made, or that the clause or schedule be added to the Bill, as the case may be.

At 12 midnight on the day on which the Third Reading of the Bill is put down as first Order, or, if that day is a Friday, at 5.30 p.m., the Speaker shall put forthwith any Question necessary to conclude the proceedings on that stage of the Bill.

Proceeding to which this Order relates shall not be interrupted (except at an Afternoon Sitting at 7.30 p.m.) under the provisions of any Standing Order relating to Sittings of the House.

After the passing of this Order, on any day on which any proceedings on the Licensing Bill stand as the first Order of the Day, no dilatory Motion on the Bill, nor under Standing Order No. 10, nor Motion to postpone a clause, shall be received unless moved by the Minister in charge of the Bill, and the Question on any such Motion shall be put forthwith. Nor shall any opposed Private Business be set down at the Evening Sitting for consideration on any of the allotted days or on the day on which the Third Reading of the Bill is put down as first Order.

If progress be reported, the Chairman shall put this Order in force in any subsequent sitting of the Committee."—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

Which Amendment was—

"In line 1, to leave out all the words after the word 'That,' and insert the words 'this House declines to consider a proposal to deprive the House of Commons, without any justification in the previous course of the debate, of all power of reasonable and adequate discussion in respect of a measure which seeks, in the absence of any authority from the country, to make fundamental and much controverted changes in laws vitally affecting the well-being of the people."—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

Question again proposed, "That the words 'the proceedings' stand part of the Question."

*MR. HELME, continuing his speech, said when the Prime Minister asked the House to consent to his proposal the right hon. Gentleman stated that every such appeal should be considered on its merits; if so, this Bill must not be rushed through. Had such a consideration governed business at the present time, no such attempt would have been made to limit the discussion on the Licensing Bill. The reason for the lack of time at this date was the want of skill and lack of courage on the part of the Government in not bringing in the Bill earlier. Having failed in that important particular, the right hon. Gentleman now sought to restrict the liberty of the House in respect to the most important subject that had been brought forward for discussion at the present time. The 12th of August and the attractions of the moors should not be allowed to weigh against the public interest, and the House, therefore, had a right to endeavour to prevent these proposals being carried into effect. Every Government had a right to rely on the loyalty of the Party supporting it; but if the right hon. Gentleman pressed his followers to give a Party vote on this question, the vote would be given against the better judgment of many hon. Members on the Unionist side of the House. That, of course, was no concern of the Opposition, whose clear duty was to oppose the proposal and the Bill to the utmost in their power, and if defeated, support the statement of their leader in the clearest manner and refuse to accept the Bill as a settlement of the licensing question. They must carry the question to the hustings and allow the constituencies to give their verdict in the ballot boxes—at any rate he for one would support the interests of the nation against that of the trade.

MR. SPEAR (Devonshire, Tavistock) said that, having regard to the fact that the Government had passed the Childrens Bill, the Habitual Drunkards Bill, and the Scottish Licensing Bill, he had looked forward with the greatest hope to the measure now under consideration; and he was not even now without hope that there might be found in it the foundation of an enactment which would promote temperance by methods which would at the same time be just and equitable to the holders of licences. Nevertheless, he felt that there were grave difficulties in the measure, and he ventured to think that the time allotted by the right hon. Gentleman for its discussion was altogether insufficient for the purpose. It would not be in the interests either of temperance or of the trade that the measure should be passed through the House immaturely and imperfectly, with the result that it would be reconsidered with all the bitterness which was unhappily aroused by the question. He hoped that the Government would give more time, so that a final settlement might be secured. The Opposition had recognised the justice of compensation, and he had been hopeful that the Government would endeavour to meet the Opposition, and to seek to promote a lasting settlement. While not prepared by his vote to take any steps to destroy the Bill, he hoped that even yet time might be given to remove defects in it and to secure a permanent settlement of the licensing question.

Mr. ATHERLEY-JONES (Durham, N.W.) said the speech to which the House had just listened might be taken correctly to reflect the private opinion of perhaps the majority of hon. Members sitting opposite. No reasonable man could doubt but that the time offered by the Government was wholly inadequate for the fair deliberation that Parliament was entitled to in such a matter as this. The right hon. Gentleman had quoted the precedent of Mr. Gladstone's Motion in 1893, when the Home Rule Bill was before the House, but there was no analogy between Mr. Gladstone's action then and that of the present Government now. When Mr. Gladstone proposed his closure Resolution in 1893 the House had been in Committee for twenty-eight days, but the Home Rule Bill had been under discussion in the House of Commons for no less than eighty-two days, whilst in this case the Bill had only been debated on Second Reading for two and a half days and before the Committee two days. He did not propose to compare in their intricacies and their far-reaching results the constitutional changes sought to be made by the Home Rule Bill of 1893 with the Licensing Bill of 1904, but, as had been pointed out by the right hon. Member for the Cambridge University, this matter affected the welfare of the people in their social, moral, and economic conditions to an extent which it was impossible to conceive any other measure would affect. This Bill would become law and the Leader of the House when bringing in a measure which he intended to pass into law was bound to take every care that deliberation and debate in this House on every clause were safeguarded. It was far different with regard to the Home Rule Bill of 1893. Mr. Gladstone knew it was doomed, and he would never have attempted to pass his closure Resolutions but for two reasons, one of which was that the Bill would not pass into law without a further appeal to the country and the other that there was a mass of domestic legislation which he desired to promote at the time. Speaking from a House of Commons point of view he asserted that any hon. Member who really considered this question fairly and squarely must undoubtedly come to the conclusion that justice had not been done to the honour and dignity of that Assembly nor had anything been done to secure its efficiency in the future. There were in this Bill a number of most complicated questions which required discussion; the discretion of the magistrate, a question not of principle but of *modus*, and the question of compensation and its incidence. There were scores of controversial topics of vast magnitude in this Bill. It would not be possible, even if the House agreed among themselves that certain Amendments should be adopted, for a Committee of twenty experts in local reform to come to a decision on the matter in the six days to be allotted, let alone a Chamber of 670 Members. He quite agreed that the tactics of the Opposition with regard to this Bill were obstructive, using that word in its legitimate and proper sense, because they regarded this as vicious legislation which should be opposed by all their power. But while that was the case the responsibility for affording full opportunities for discussion must still lie with the Government. Therefore it was that he joined in the appeal made by hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House that the right hon. Gentleman would consent to extend the absolutely inadequate amount of time in order that the Bill might be properly discussed.

Colonel LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping) said he found no difficulty in voting for the Resolution before the House because he had a very strong desire to see this legislation properly carried through. Many Members, like himself, disliked any attempts to infringe on the ordinary Rules of Procedure and to restrict the time for the discussion of business, but there were occasions like the present when it became necessary. It was an unpleasant duty, which had been occasionally forced on the Leaders on both sides, and hon. Gentlemen opposite had adopted a similar position in precisely the same way. The Motion was a necessity. The hon. Gentleman who had just spoken gave the case away. He said he detested and hated the Bill, and thought it right to obstruct it in every way. He did not mention the word "obstruction"; but there were more ways than one of choking a dog. It was a very easy matter to smother a Bill with Amendments; but the business of the Government was to legislate. Hon. Gentlemen opposite would allow that without this Motion it would be impossible to get the Licensing Bill through in Parliamentary time. He had heard allusions to moors and shooting; but, as far as he knew, his hon. friends would be content to remain in attendance until the Bill were passed. Hon. Gentlemen opposite were determined that, if they could prevent it, the Bill should not be passed. What was the alternative? If they were unable to pass the Bill, they would have to resign; but with a majority of ninety they did not intend to resign. Why should they resign to please hon. Gentlemen opposite? Their intention was to pass such legislation as they thought fit. This Bill was a simple measure of justice; it would be productive of good results; and they were determined to pass it into law. He believed. with his hon. and gallant, friend that if speeches on both sides were curtailed, there would be more time available for the consideration of details; but he would not join in the appeal to his Leader to extend the period mentioned in the Motion. The Opposition, in that case, would, like Oliver Twist, ask for more. Any man who had the love of Parliament at heart must regret when an occasion like the present arose; but, nevertheless, they should not be prevented from passing a measure which they believed to be just.

Mr. BRYCE said that although it was quite true that every additional day which might be given by the Government would *pro tanto* diminish the evil, still, that would not remove his objection to the Bill. The pitiable bleatings of hon. Gentlemen on the other side of the House for an extension of the time to be allotted were indications of uneasy consciences. It might be necessary in certain circumstances to resort to such an expedient as closure by compartments, but the necessity had not arisen with the Licensing Bill. Much of the difficulty the Government had met with arose from mismanagement of business early in the session. On three conditions alone could such a Motion be justified. In the first place, there must be obstruction, and it had been admitted there had been none in the present case. The Prime Minister did not found his case on obstruction.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he had not mentioned obstruction, and in that he had followed the precedents of his predecessors.

Mr. BRYCE said Mr. Gladstone might not have used the word obstruction, but everybody would remember what took place in 1893, and his whole argument was directed to showing that, under the methods of opposition adopted, it would be impossible to get the Bill through.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: That is what I said.

Mr. BRYCE: The right hon. Gentleman did not say a single word against the method of discussion.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he had pointed out how the course followed made the passing of the Bill within a reasonable period practically impossible.

Mr. BRYCE said the right hon. Gentleman did not say there had been anything inconsistent with Parliamentary usage.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Nor did Mr. Gladstone.

Mr. BRYCE said it would be a large order to attempt to quote what Mr. Gladstone said. Those who remembered the debates of the period would know that on every occasion every question, however remote, was used as far as possible by the skill and diligence of the Opposition. Nothing of the kind had happened on the present occasion, and 171 Amendments had been given notice of by Members on the other side, certainly not with any desire to defeat the Bill. It would have been quite possible to get the Bill through in spite of the many Amendments in a reasonable time, considering how many Amendments were repetition and how they crumpled up under the Chairman's ruling. He could say with some confidence that the discussion on this Bill had been eminently a businesslike discussion. During the thirty-four hours consumed on the Second Reading and in Committee 115 speeches had been made on his side of the House and 135 on the other side. Where there was no obstruction and no abuse of the Rules of the House, it became unfair and tyrannical to impose upon the House a Resolution of this kind. If they set up this precedent, whenever a Government had neglected to pass their legislation and to use their time in the earlier part of the session, they would have nothing to do but to come to the House and propose a drastic Resolution of this kind on the plea that they must carry their Bills before 15th August. The second condition was that there should have been adequate discussion. On that point he would only say that they had not got to the bottom of the principle on which compensation should be given, especially in the case of new licences; and if they stifled discussion on the principle on which taxation was to be imposed upon those licence-holders who would gain no benefit from the Government scheme they would leave behind a keen sense of injustice. The third condition was that the Bill should be one which the country did not disapprove of. The Government ought not to resort to an exceptionally severe process for putting a Bill through unless there was a reasonable moral certainty that the country was with them. They could not have more conclusive evidence than that afforded by a series of by-elections that the country was against this Bill and those who introduced it. The whole sentiment of the country, expressed in Petitions and public meetings, had been unequivocally against the Bill, and a large volume of the opinion of the clergy of the Church of England was also opposed to the Bill. The clergy of the Church of England did not regard this Bill as a great temperance measure. The right hon. Gentleman spoke of the Bill as a measure of eternal justice. Did eternal justice require double the value of the licensed premises? The right hon. Gentleman called the Bill a measure of great temperance reform. He could not forget that two years ago he told the House that the Education Bill was a great measure of educational reform. That was not now the opinion of the great majority in this country. If it were, the sooner the right hon. Gentleman gave them an opportunity of appealing to Cæsar the better. He would not speak of Party results, although he was bound to say that if they wanted something to use in a Party sense they could desire nothing better than that the Bill should be passed by closure by compartments.

Two results must follow from the methods which the Government had followed. In the first place it would destroy the moral authority which this Bill would have had when it became an Act. If the Government ignored public opinion, public opinion would ignore their work. Public opinion would not have any respect for Bills passed by tyrannical methods. In the second place, the Motion struck a blow at the House of Commons itself. The House of Commons was the mainspring of the Constitution in this country. It enjoyed immense power. It was not like Parliaments in other countries bound by a written Constitution. t had no check except that imposed by its own traditions and the feeling of protection it owed to the country; and, therefore, it ought to be especially careful of its power. If the British Parliament was more trusted than the Parliaments of other countries, if it was free from restrictions to which other Parliaments were subjected it was because the traditions of the House of Commons had won the confidence of the country and had made the people believe that that Assembly would not misuse the powers entrusted to it. The greatest of all reasons for that confidence was that the House had been allowed freedom of debate, and if the security for that freedom were once destroyed the confidence and authority which the House of Commons had hitherto enjoyed would inevitably be weakened. The solidity and strength of the Constitution of the country depended largely upon the existence of perfect confidence between the House of Commons and the people. The people ought to trust the House of Commons, and the House of Commons ought to feel that it would never go beyond what it believed to be the will of the people; but if a temporary majority were allowed to disregard the indications of public opinion, to silence the minority and to pass its measures without proper discussion, the relations which had so happily existed in the past would be destroyed. Within the last twenty-five years the House had suffered a great deal. It had declined from the freedom of debate, the openness of spirit, and the happy flexibility which its rules of procedure gave to it. No doubt a part of the alteration had been rendered necessary by the changes of time; but much more had been done than was needed, and no one had done more by his changes in the rules of procedure to injure the efficiency of the House of Commons than the right hon. Gentleman opposite. The present proposal would strike a further blow at the freedom and authority of the House of Commons—a blow which seemed to him to be the *dernier ressort* of Ministers who had got into a difficult position from which they were determined at all hazards to escape. It was an interference with the freedom of the House more violent and unjustifiable than had ever been made before, because it was the tyrannical exercise of power by a temporary and accidental majority.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN (Birmingham, W.): I am anxious to say a few words on this Resolution, because my Parliamentary experience is so long that I recollect perfectly every successful attempt which has been made during the last 30 years to abridge the liberties of free speech in this House. The only complaint I make of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen, to a portion of which I listened, is that it is a mere repetition of speeches which have been made alternately from both sides of the House. Upon every occasion when this subject has been brought before us, those who were opposed to the Bill which was the subject of the Resolution have got up and said it was destroying the efficiency of the mother of parliaments, that it was striking a fatal blow at the liberties of the United Kingdom, and so forth. The most remarkable of these attempts in my opinion, was the closure upon the Home Rule Bill. I opposed that measure, with certain qualifications, on the ground that the particular Bill under discussion had not been sufficiently discussed. We have heard that in the course of the present argument. I also opposed it on the ground that the Bill was an exceptional Bill in this sense—that whereas all other Bills before the House of Commons can, after they have been passed, if they prove to be failures, be repealed and the mischief undone, that was a Bill which, for good or for evil, was irrevocable if once it was accepted. You cannot pass a great constitutional change of that kind with any expectation of being able to retrace your steps. But we have been reminded by the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down that it will be in the power of that Party, when they, as they not unnaturally hope shortly to do, occupy the Benches on this side of the House, to repeal this Bill if they then believe it is open to all the objections they now take to it. That constitutes, I think, a very important distinction between the Home Rule Bill and any other Bill that we have had subsequently to deal with. But, after all, I am perfectly prepared to admit that our action, on both sides of the House, in regard to this matter is actuated very largely by our Party sympathy and by our feeling in regard to the particular measure before the House. If we think the measure a good one we wish to see it carried and we wish to remove all the obstacles to its progress. If we think the measure a bad one we wish to kill it and we do not care by what means. I invite the House to consider the matter from that extremely practical and common sense point of view.

The right hon. Gentleman delivered a very confident opinion with regard to the merits of this measure and the opinion of the country upon it. I differ from him in both respects. I think I have taken a more active part than the right hon. Gentleman in temperance reform. My first considerable speech in this House, now some twenty-eight years ago, was made upon this subject, and I have not changed in the slightest degree the opinions I then expressed in regard to it. I have an intense sense of the importance of temperance reform, and it has always been a matter of the deepest regret to me that during all this period, and even for a longer period if we go back to the origin of temperance reform, practically nothing of substantial importance has been done by legislation. I believe that most of that is due to the extreme views of men whose honesty and whose conscientious convictions I recognise as much as I wish that others should my own, but who have absolutely refused to adopt that great principle in politics that half a loaf is better than no bread. They refused in the time before I was in the House of Commons to accept the great reform proposed by Mr. Bruce, who afterwards become Lord Aberdare, and they refused to accept the reform, which I always thought was of the greatest importance, proposed by Mr. Goschen, and they are now opposing with perfectly fanatical opposition this Bill, which in many very important particulars, although it may not go as far as they desire, is an enormous advance in the direction of temperance reform. Following the right hon. Gentleman, let me ask him to carry his memory back. What have we been urging during all this period? I accept him as a colleague in temperance reform. One of the things we have been urging is that it would be desirable to reduce the the number of licensed houses.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The right hon. Gentleman, although he says he is following the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Aberdeen, is doing something more. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Aberdeen did express an opinion that this Motion ought to be opposed on the ground that the Bill was not popular in the country, but the right hon. Gentleman is now going into the history of temperance legislation, which, I think, is beyond the Motion.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Mr. Speaker, I bow, as I always do, to your ruling, and your ruling prevents me from expressing, however, briefly, the reasons for my conviction that this Bill would be a great advance in temperance reform. At any rate, I may say this, that that is the honest conviction of many of us, who may perhaps agree with the right hon. Gentleman that the Bill does not go as far as it might go, but who would be glad to accept it for what it does actually give us, for the advance which we think it makes.

Then I come to the next point of the right hon. Gentleman, which is that this Bill is not popular in the country. He challenges us to test that by going to the country. Is the right hon. Gentleman prepared to assert when we go to the country that that is to be the issue? If it is we shall win. But if, on the contrary, it is "Chin, Chin, Chinaman," if it is "Do you wear a pig-tail?" then I really cannot say what result an appeal to the country upon that noble issue may produce. It is all very well to make these appeals to the country beforehand, these challenges, but I would remind the Committee of an occasion to which I have referred, when the closure was applied to the Home Rule Bill. I really do not recollect at this interval of time how the by-elections went on at that period, but I know we challenged the Government to dissolve on that particular issue. As a matter of fact, that was the issue at the election following, and we know the result, we know that the country gave a most distinct reply, and justified our opposition to the Home Rule Bill. That is in reply to these, I am perfectly prepared to admit, rather irrelevant matters I come back to the question of the closure as applied to a great Bill upon which there is difference of opinion. I say it is perfectly natural for hon. Gentlemen opposite to attempt to destroy the Bill, taking the view they do, and we on our side, who take a different view of the value of the Bill, are bound to do everything we can to carry it. But I would ask the right hon. Gentleman to consider what his great Leader said upon this subject in the course of those debates to which I have referred. Mr. Gladstone did not put the question of the closure upon the merits of the Home Rule Bill, but, curiously enough, not having the fears of the right hon. Gentleman as to the degradation of Parliament, he put it on the ground of the dignity and the efficiency of Parliament, and it is on that ground that I put the whole question to the House. I am looking, perhaps as one is accustomed to do as one grows older, a little more into the future than younger men need do, and I am not thinking so much of this Bill as I am thinking of the general principle --- how is the efficiency of Parliament to be preserved? What Mr. Gladstone said was that he regretted, and everyone believed him, to abridge the existing liberties of

Parliament, but that he did so because without it the great foundations of its existence would be destroyed and the will of the majority would no longer prevail. Now there is a majority of Parliament, and—I take for granted the cheer which will follow this observation—there is a majority in the country, and the two may differ. But for the time, and whilst Parliament is sitting, our object as Members of Parliament should be to preserve Parliament as the representative, for the period, of the country, and to give to the majority of Parliament for the time being the weight that a majority ought always to have. That is a doctrine which I have always held, a doctrine which I have preached from time to time. The particular way of securing that the majority should prevail is, of course, a matter on which there may be difference of opinion.

Let me ask this: Which Party in the State has the greatest interest in this matter? I admit that there was a time when I thought the Liberal Party had the greatest interest in this principle, because I was brought up to think, and I thought, and I am not certain that it was not true, at any rate at that time, that it was to the Liberal Party that we were to look for social and legislative progress. Well, I very much doubt whether any impartial man can say that that is any longer the case. The Liberal Party has been engaged for a long time [OPPOSITION interruption]—I do not want to weary the House ["Go on"]—but I was rather anxious to clear the way for so nothing I have to say in reference to what I believe is the real issue at stake. What I was going to say was that the Liberal Party, as every Conservative would recognise, has had a great work to perform, and has performed it; but that in regard to another part of our legislative work—namely, the work of social reform—I do not say why, I am not speaking in a controversial sense, but it has happened that most of our social legislation has been brought forward and carried by the Conservative and Unionist Party. [OPPOSITION cries of "No."] I am not putting this forward as a Party argument, I am putting it forward to show that neither Party has any longer a special interest in preserving all the methods of obstruction. If there were a Party in this House, if the Conservative Party were a Party of pure reaction, of pure inactivity, of pure opposition to every reform, then it is they, not you, who would have a supreme interest in opposing every measure of closure, in opposing every restriction upon liberty of speech in this House. I say that is no longer the case, and, speaking to my friends around me, I say you have the same interest which those who call themselves the Party of progress have—I will not dispute it for the moment—in restoring and in increasing the efficiency of this House.

The efficiency of this House at this moment is *nil*. It is all very well to bring up these old arguments we have just heard from the Member for Aberdeen, which we of this Party produced at the time of the closure on the Home Rule Bill, and of every other closure. That is all leather and prunella. The real thing is that as long as we treat each of these questions separately of course we shall be divided into Parties. Those who oppose any particular Bill will be on one side and those who are in favour of it will be on the other. Cannot we take a wider view of the whole situation? Can we not consider the necessities of the time? Can we not see, without attributing any special dose of original sin either to one Party or the other, that circumstances have so far changed that, whereas in the time of Pitt and Fox there were at the very most but fifty Members of the House who ever addressed it, there are now 670 Gentleman every one of whom thinks, and no doubt with good reason, that he is as well entitled and as well able to address the House as anybody else? Can you not see that in these circumstances if every man claims his right each Party in turn will be paralysed, that each Party in turn will be unable to give effect to its principles and secure for them a fair trial? My desire is that when Gentlemen opposite come in they shall have the fullest opportunity of carrying out every promise they have made. I would like nothing better. In existing circumstances do they think that would be the case? We shall be rising—perhaps I myself shall be rising from the opposite side repeating the arguments of the Member for Aberdeen, and imploring the House to consider the dignity of Parliament, and I know not what, because I am opposed to a Bill to repeal the Bill which is now under the consideration of the House. Are we to go on for ever playing this purely partisan game on one side equally with the other? Are we to go on doing this without considering the situation to which we are reduced? I agree with Mr. Gladstone—[OPPOSITION laughter.] I do not understand hon. Gentleman who cheer ironically. I have quoted Mr. Gladstone. I agree entirely, and I always have agreed entirely, with what Mr. Gladstone said—namely, that the whole of this great constitutional system of ours, the existence of Parliament and everything else, is all machinery for securing peaceably that the will of the majority should prevail—the majority for the time. The business of the minority is to make itself into a majority and then in turn its will should prevail. Finally, we come to a state of things when what has been decided is accepted by both sides. But my real desire is that some measure should be devised which would give to each Party in turn—it is not, therefore, a partisan point—an opportunity of securing that the principles upon which it has gone to the country and secured the mandate of the country should prevail.

In my opinion our present system is unsatisfactory. At present, as I have said, each Party in turn resorts to this arbitrary method. When Gentlemen opposite are in power, it may be in a short time, they will have to resort to precisely the same measure and we shall oppose it. We shall say you are destroying the efficiency of Parliament. We shall say that it is tyranny of the worst kind; we shall challenge you to go to the country. We shall tell you that the people are against you. We shall say everything. We shall resort to every platitude and every commonplace which you have resorted to in the present debate. I know my observations will not have the slightest effect on the division to-night. It is not with that object that I am addressing them to the House. But I do think it desirable from time to time to recall the House to the fact that each Party in turn is paralysed under our present system, and that the time has come when both sides of the House if they were wise—not in a time of excitement like this, but in some more peaceable hours—would attempt to devise some system by which the time of Parliament, necessarily limited, should be distributed so that, although there should be a fair amount of discussion, no Bill proposed by the majority and supported by a sufficient majority should be killed merely by time. It is not necessary to make any charge of obstruction. To my mind it is absurd that any one should try to conceal the fact that he has obstructed. I have obstructed, you have obstructed, we have obstructed, and, if I may put it in the future tense, I will say we shall obstruct. Therefore, that is not a charge that is to be brought in by either side against the other. On the present case all I have to say is, believing as I do that this Bill is a measure of temperance reform, believing firmly as I do that, if we could take an issue upon this Bill alone, we should find that the majority of the people were entirely with us, and knowing as I do that, under the existing circumstances of the House, it cannot be carried without the closure, I shall vote most heartily for the Resolution.

*DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) said the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham had told them that his first speech in the House was in favour of temperance reform. He had no doubt that it was a first-class speech, because that was in the right hon. Gentleman's Radical days. He fancied he remembered a notice in the *Birmingham Daily Post* of that time that Mr. Councillor Joseph Chamberlain, was to preside at a meeting to be addressed by Mr. George Trevelyan on the subject of the Local Veto Bill

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: My hon. friend will allow me to say that that is not a correct statement from my biography. I do not remember the Local Veto Bill. Mr. George Trevelyan did come down to address a meeting. But I was not councillor at the time; I was mayor

*DR. MACNAMARA said his recollection was that the object of the meeting was in support of the Local Veto Bill, but he might be wrong. At any rate he knew that the right hon. Gentleman had first said that if the Government of that day went to the country upon the Licensing Bill "We shall win." He distinctly remembered the right hon. Gentleman using that phrase. Now in detailing his policy at Greenock last Autumn the right hon. Gentleman said "On this we shall win." He did not know whether the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham was quite so sure about that to-day, but the sooner the Government took the verdict of the country upon it the better. There was one important feature which ought not to be lost sight of by the Prime Minister. On Friday last there were about twenty speeches delivered upon this Motion from both sides of the House and only three of them were in favour of it. There had also been twenty speeches that day, and again only three had been in favour of the Motion made by the Prime Minister. Upon this Motion the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham took up rather a detached position, and therefore he put him into a class by himself. He was glad to be able to say that he found himself in happy agreement with one thing which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham said. The right hon. Gentleman had asked them to remember what their great Leader Mr. Gladstone said upon the introduction of the closure on the 29th of June, 1893, on the Home Rule Bill. He would ask the right hon. Gentleman to remember what his Leader the present Prime Minister—he believed he was the right hon. Gentleman's Leader at the present time—had said. He said in 1893—

> "Whatever be the grounds for adopting this Resolution it is not one of necessity, but it is adopted upon the ground of expediency, and if I may say so, not of Parliamentary expediency but of Party expediency."

The Motion before the House had been introduced for the very same reason. On the same occasion the Prime Minister complained very bitterly of the manner in which Mr. Gladstone had frittered away the early part of the session of 1893, and the right hon. Gentleman protested against the Government coming down at the beginning of July and asking the House to leave undiscussed the most vital provisions of the Home Rule Bill. He endorsed those views to-day. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham said that circumstances altered cases, and the Prime Minister had told them that they must take each of these cases upon its merits. They could not do that upon the present occasion because this case had no merits. With regard to the Resolution of the Prime Minister, two painful considerations filled his mind. The first was that the Prime Minister, who should be the guardian of the liberties, privileges, and functions of Parliament, had ostentatiously raised indifference—indeed, he might go the length of saying contempt—for the deliberations of Parliament to a fine art. The second deplorable circumstance was that the Prime Minister had signally failed to utilise the enormous gifts and opportunities which had been placed at his disposal. Here was a man of unique intellectual distinction, who had behind him an unrivalled Parliamentary majority, docile and willing to do what he pleased, and that man, who with the gifts which God had bestowed upon him might have written his name on the scroll of honour for some great work in the uplifting of the people and in the improvement of their social and moral well-being, had elected deliberately to be remembered by this Motion on behalf of this Bill. There was no censure which he could pass upon that action more bitter than the private censure which the right hon. Gentleman must ultimately pass himself, unspoken, on his own conduct.

MR. BOUSFIELD (Hackney, N) said that this Bill was one which hon. Gentlemen opposite had declared they would resist by every means in their power, and they were using the Committee stage for the purpose of defeating and destroying this measure. He was one of those who desired to see the Bill amended in important particulars, but he was not going to play the game of hon. Members opposite and use the Committee stage for the purpose of defeating the Bill. It would not be consistent with the honour and dignity of this House to allow the Committee stage of a Bill to be used for that purpose, because it would render their proceedings entirely nugatory. It seemed to him that one thing they had to consider was how much time they could allot to the consideration of this measure. The Amendment which had been proposed raised a question of principle, and therefore the Government were right in allotting the proper proportion of the time at their disposal to this measure. From the point of view of the business men in this House, to whom it was absolutely necessary that the length of the session should be confined within reasonable limits, the only business-like course for the House to adopt was to mark out the amount of time which the House could spend upon this particular measure.

*MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham) said he was sure that everybody, without distinction of Party, would be glad to see the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham in his place again. He was particularly glad to see him, because the right hon. Gentleman and himself were to a certain extent in the same boat. He wanted to see that Government turned out and go to the country; so did the right hon. Gentleman. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh."] The only difference between them was that he was able to express his opinion, and the right hon. Gentleman was for the present dissembling his. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh."] He thought the right hon. Gentleman had given a very odd reason why those who were opposed to this measure and other measures which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham would like to introduce should support the proposal which had been made by the Prime Minister. He had pointed out that the Conservative Party in the past had always been opposed to these violent methods of procedure, and that the Liberal Party had always been in favour of them. Now he said there had been a change, and he declared that on both sides they had definite positive ambitions to carry out which he suggested could only be carried out at the expense of their ordinary Parliamentary procedure. When he thought of some of the ambitious schemes which the right hon. Gentleman desired to carry he was not inclined to vote for making procedure much more drastic by the hope and belief that the present proposal might some day be imitated by the right hon. Gentleman in order to carry the tariff proposals which he had submitted t the country. [MINISTERIAL cries of: "Oh, oh" and "Divide."] He quite agreed with the right hon. Gentleman's foresight in this matter, because nobody could imagine how he could carry his tariff proposals without mutilating the procedure of the House of Commons.

This debate had provided them with a very excellent specimen of the Prime Minister's dialectical methods, for he was making a very important Motion, and asking the House to make a most momentous departure. This Motion had been the subject of a large amount of criticism from this side of the House and also from the Ministerial side, and in reply to that criticism the Prime Minister had made a fascinating speech which did not contain any justification of his proposal, but which was full of all sorts of animadversions upon precedents from other Governments established under totally different circumstances at other times. He would not delay the House by endeavouring to trace the resemblances between the procedure the Prime Minister had now adopted and the procedure which the last Liberal Administration adopted. It was true that there were points of resemblance between the procedure on the Evicted Tenants Bill and that which they were now asked to adopt. The principal point of resemblance was that both procedures were proposed as rather desperate measures by Governments in extremely difficult circumstances, on the eve of a dissolution which was to be followed by an election extremely disastrous to them. He could quite understand that some right hon. Gentlemen on the Front Opposition Bench had been a little embarrassed by the resemblance which might be traced between those two occasions, but that did not help the case of the Prime Minister. The right hon. Gentleman could not quote the precedents which had been referred to with any satisfaction, because no man had denounced with more vigour and sincerity the procedure which was adopted on those occasions. The House had to consider, in the first place, the situation and the causes leading to the present proposal, and, in the second place, whether it was, in fact, a reasonable thing to compress the proceedings in Committee on the Licensing Bill into six days. The hon. Member for Spen Valley, in his speech on Friday, went so far as to say that it would be ludicrous to attempt to discuss this Bill upon the time table which the Prime Minister proposed under this Motion, and the right hon Gentleman the Member for Montrose went further and said it would be a farce to discuss all the complicated provisions of this Bill within the six days provided by this time table. No one surely would deny that such a discussion, under such circumstances, so mutilated, so restricted, so arbitrarily curtailed, would be valueless and a useless waste of time. If that were so, he was astonished at the Prime Minister's moderation, because if he intended to pass this Bill without going through the formality of a Committee stage he wondered that the Prime Minister had allowed even six days. He would say to the Prime Minister, what the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham had no doubt often said to him in private, "Why not go the whole hog ?'

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I did not hear the hon. Gentleman exactly. Do I understand that he is quoting to the House something which he says I said to him in private ?

*MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL said he was venturing to address an argument to the Prime Minister, who was not there, but would perhaps see it in the usual way, and asking him why he should take six days over this mutilated discussion upon this Bill in Committee, why not go the whole hog ? He suggested that as advice which the right hon. Gentleman might have addressed to the Prime Minister at some time or other. He might as well be hanged for a sheep as a lamb; why not one day, one division, or, if it be thought right, why not take it without a division ? What was to be gained by this "purposeless discussion" ? Every argument he had used to justify this proposal would justify the much more convenient course he had just suggested. Nothing was gained, but something was lost. Candour was lost. Five days of Parliamentary time were lost which might be occupied in discussing some of those interesting questions which the House was prevented from discussing by blocking Motions. They might discuss Army reform, or take up the Prime Minister's vote of confidence in himself as an Amendment to what he was entitled to call the Black Resolution. He could only see one conceivable advantage the Prime Minister had to gain by the elaborate procedure he had adopted. He wanted to keep up appearances, to make the country treat the Bill as if discussed, to invest arbitrary and unconstitutional procedure with a sort of sham decorum. This desire to keep up appearances at all costs was very curious. He would venture to repeat a story he heard the other day. The editor of a newspaper in the Western States of America received a letter one morning from a man whose acquaintance he had the privilege of enjoying, which began as follows—

> "Dear Sir,—I regret to inform you that last night I had an altercation with Mr. Dawkins of this city, in the course of which I shot and killed him."

[MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh" and "Divide."] He claimed the same courtesy that had been extended to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham. [Renewed MINISTERIAL interruptions.]

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N): You have got to listen to it whether you like it or not. The hon. Member for Oldham is not on your side now.

*MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL said he did not wish to weary hon. Members opposite and he had no desire to continue his story if they did not wish to hear it. [OPPOSITION cries of "Go on" and "Why not ?" and MINISTERIALIST cries of "Divide."] It was quite obvious that the amenities of debate could not be indulged in by anyone who had differed from colleagues on the Ministerial Benches. since all courtesy, chivalry, and even ordinary fair play were thus refused—thus ill-naturedly refused. He would confine himself strictly to the argument. He could understand the desire of the Prime Minister to invest his proceedings with a certain air of formality, but he asked why should the Opposition join in what the right hon. Member for Montrose described, and what could only be called, a dismal farce, the whole object of which was to delude the country into the belief that the Bill had been adequately discussed, to invoke the authority of the House of Commons for a piece of legislation which was nothing less than an act of Executive usurpation. It took a great Party to govern Great Britain by Parliamentary methods. One man might do it by unparliamentary methods. It was only when something had occurred to weaken the central principle, the inner life, of a Party that some particular interest in that Party laid hold of the machinery and mechanism of Government and used it to further its own special interests without regard to the welfare of the country as a whole. He thought those who had listened to the debates during the past few days must have noticed a more bitter element in them than had marked the ordinary discussions in this House They had been grappling with a great trust. They were face to face with a great commercial organisation mobilised for the effective purposes of political warfare. They had seen it thrust its greedy fingers down the back of the Treasury Bench and pull the coat tails of Ministers, and when they reflected that the Prime Minister was dependent for his return to the House upon the votes of a certain class of liquor-sellers in his constituency [MINISTERIAL cries of "No, no" and "Withdraw," and cheers.]

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member has not committed any breach of order.

*MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL said they had realised what it meant to fight against a great commercial combination which took a prominent part in political action, and the reflection occurred to hon. Members when they saw this great trust in working order, "Thank God, there is only one of them at present that we have to face. We have only one now, but when the Birmingham golden age is ushered in——"

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is now travelling beyond the Motion.

*MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL, continuing, said the Prime Minister had been largely responsible for the present situation. It was undoubtedly the case that the right hon. Gentleman had led the House by different methods to those of some of his predecessors. If there was some matter the House was anxious to discuss, on which the conduct of the Government was impeached, the Prime Minister did not prepare an elaborate answer to the charges. No, he put down a blocking Motion. [OPPOSITION cheers and MINISTERIAL cries of "No."]

*MR. SPEAKER: The Prime Minister's action with regard to that, even if the hon. Member is correct, is one of those past actions of the Government which cannot have contributed to produce this Motion, and cannot now be commented upon.

*MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL said it was very difficult to bring any point within the Rules of debate in the face of such interruptions. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Divide."]

MR. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe): Mr. Speaker, I rise to order. For the last ten minutes I have been endeavouring to listen to the speech of the hon. Member, and I have been unable to follow him. I think it is one of the privileges every hon. Member is entitled to that he should be heard. [Cries of "Order."] I do ask you, as Speaker of this House, to try to keep order for us. [Cries of "Oh, oh" and "Order."]

*MR. SPEAKER: It is impossible for the Speaker to compel every Member to keep silence, but I trust every hon. Member will observe the Rules of the House.

*MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL, speaking amid continued interruptions, said it would not have been strange if, when the House of Commons was unable to discuss the great question of the day, there should have been a resort to the rough-and-ready method of obstruction. But the Prime Minister had not alleged that there had been obstruction. The rights of the minority, he ventured to suggest to hon. Members opposite, were rights which they would perhaps have need to consider in days that were not far distant. He saw the Prime Minister in his place. Was it to be supposed that he was a consenting party to this uproar? [Cries of "Order."]

*MR. SPEAKER: I cannot, of course, compel the silence of every hon. Member of this House, but I would remind them that the Orders of this House as they existed more than 250 years ago make it the duty of every Member to maintain silence whilst a Member is addressing the House. No Speaker can enforce that regulation, but I appeal to the House whether it is not more conducive to the dignity of the House when a Member is speaking, whether his opinions be popular or not, that he should be allowed to proceed.

SIR GEORGE BARTLEY (Islington, N.): I wish to ask, as a point of order, whether we have not the right to show our dissent from strong personal attacks made on the Leader of the House.

*MR. SPEAKER: Personal attacks, so far as they are orderly, ought to be borne without disorderly interruption.

*MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL said he was quite at a loss to deal with these interruptions, differing as they did from those which took place at public meetings, the authors of them not being amenable to argument or appeals for fair play. But he did not desire to detain the House long. The right hon. Gentleman had said that the legislative programme of the session was not extensive. Surely it was very remarkable that he had not been able to carry out the ordinary legislative programme by ordinary Parliamentary methods. The cause which had brought about the Parliamentary breakdown did not lie on the Benches of the Opposition, but on the Benches of the other side; and what they had witnessed that night was only another element in the demoralisation which had taken place in the great Conservative Party, a demoralisation which made Members perfectly willing to come down to shout down an unpopular speaker, perfectly willing to be in their places when the liberties of the House of Commons were to be voted away, but not willing, as the hon. Member for Spen Valley had said, to forsake their dinner, not willing to forego the pleasures of Ascot, or to sit in the House later than 15th August. He had finished the observations which he desired to make, and he was bound to say that he appealed to the good sense of the House of Commons to say whether he had received fair treatment—[Cheers and cries of "Divide"]—whether the carefully-organised attack upon the liberties of debate in which the right hon. Member for West Birmingham was an accomplice and a consenting party — [Loud cries of "Order," "Withdraw," and cheers]——

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN said, Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. [Cries of "No" and interruption.] I merely wish to know, Sir, whether it is in order [interuption and cries of "Order"] for the junior Member for Oldham to say that there is a conspiracy against him in which I am an accomplice—a statement which is absolutely untrue. [Cries of "Oh" and "Order" and cheers and counter-cheers.]

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member should not make charges of that kind. [Cheers and cries of "Withdraw."]

*MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL, who was again received with cries of "Withdraw," said: Mr. Speaker, if I have said anything which passes in any degree the limitations of the order of debate [cries of "Order" and "Withdraw"] I completely withdraw it. I have made my protest which I venture to commit to the good sense and calmer consideration of the House.

*MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland), who spoke amid noise and interruption, said he was only going to say a few sentences. He was endeavouring to make his voice heard hundreds of miles beyond this House. The question now before the House was, in his opinion, one of the most important that had ever been submitted to any Parliament. They had long been accustomed in this country to point the finger of scorn at the ways of Tammany. They had been educated to jeer at the struggles of candidates for the Presidency of South American republics to secure place and power and profit for themselves. But surely the degradation of the House of Commons, the Mother of Parliaments, had reached full measure when hon. Members were brought here to vote closure by compartments on a Bill of such importance as this. In connection with Home Rule there was no question of this or that company's shares going up or down. During the discussion of this Bill the House had presented a deplorable spectacle. More than once a representative of the great brewing interest had been seen hanging over and directing the Premier of this country as to how he was to act, and they had had the same hon. Gentleman in the lobbies telling hon. Members how they were to vote. That was a humiliating position for Members of the House of Commons to be placed in. The people of the country were entitled to have some knowledge of the character of the legislation proposed, but this had been denied to them in respect of this measure at any rate. The Government did not seem to understand their own minds. In the course of the discussion which had taken place on the Bill it had been shown that the Prime Minister and the Home Secretary did not understand the real character of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER said the hon. Member must confine himself to the question before the House.

*Mr. CATHCART WASON said he only wanted to show that the Prime Minister and the Home Secretary did not understand the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not the point now before the House.

*Mr. CATHCART WASON: May I allude to this point. The hon. Member for Tunbridge Wells moved an Amendment, and the Solicitor-General promised to give consideration to the point raised——

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not in order for the hon. Member to refer to discussions that took place on Amendments.

*Mr. CATHCART WASON said he only wished to allude to the matters to show the imbecility of the Government in regard to their own Bill. If this Bill were submitted to the constituencies in its nakedness and baldness it would be scouted from John O' Groats to Land's End. He would venture to make an appeal to hon. Members opposite with regard to the effect this measure would have on the social welfare of the people of the country. There was not a single day when millions of the King's subjects did not pray to the Almighty Father not to lead them into temptation. It was the duty of an Assembly like this to help the people, and to prevent them so far as possible from being led into temptation. That end would not be promoted by the passing of this Bill.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): In the few words it will be my duty to address to the House I shall endeavour to follow the good example propounded and exhibited by the Leader of the House on Friday when he introduced his Motion. He said that he would avoid saying anything which might add to the excitement which very naturally prevailed on such an occasion. I think that is the duty of all Members of the House at this time, perhaps in a larger degree than in the case of some others on the part of those who have some authority over individual sections of the House. It is not that I do not feel strongly the nature of the Vote that is going to be taken and the effect of it, as I believe, upon the general estimate by the world of this House and its deliberations; but above all things let us do what we have to do with dignity and in order. If I try to avoid saying anything of an irritating character, though one cannot altogether avoid controversial topics, I trust that my efforts will be responded to by hon. Members opposite. My intention is perhaps rather ambitious; it is to say something new, or at all events to bring the House back to the argument the Leader of the House used when he proposed this Motion. We have had a pretty full discussion on the general question of these Motions, their nature, their use, and their abuse. We have had instances drawn from previous occasions fully analysed and discussed, and we have had all the influence that can be brought to bear on the mind of anyone going to vote in relation to the Bill itself and its position in Committee at this moment; but I am going to take up the plea on which the right hon. Gentleman founded this Motion. He based his case for guillotining the Bill on the first clause on the time and the business of the session; he challenged examination of the course of business during the session and a comparison with other sessions; in fact, his case was practically a vote of censure on the Opposition; and from that point of view I will make a few observations. He said—

> "If the House insists on spending night after night in criticism the time given to legislation must be curtailed."

Before Easter, he said, one afternoon only was given to legislation. Again, he says—

> "I say, and say emphatically, if you are going to allow the Government"—

but who does he mean by "you"? I thought the Government were in charge of business—

> "If you are going to allow the Government to have one afternoon before Easter and seven between Easter and Whitsuntide, you are making an apportionment of time which is not enough for legislation and too much for criticism."

But my answer is, it is not we who made the apportionment of time, it is he. He then went on to challenge a comparison between this session and other sessions, and this challenge I reply to. It involves not the merits of this particular Bill, not the question what may be the demand for the Bill or the effects that may result from it not passing; we hear very little of that part of the case, for, indeed, there is no demand. As has been pointed out, petitions—which after all are an old-fashioned way of testing public opinion somewhat fallen into discredit and disuse of late years—petitions have been all on one side, there being but a solitary one on the other. For myself I have, since the Bill was introduced, received copies of 4,000 resolutions passed at public meetings and by public bodies in opposition to the Bill, and as these Resolutions were accompanied by an intimation that copies had been sent to the Prime Minister, the right hon. Gentleman must be equally well aware of the state of public opinion. There is nothing connected with the Bill, or the feeling of the country towards it, its urgency or its necessity, in the case of the right hon. Gentleman; but that the business of the session, including the proceedings on this Bill, would have been in an advanced and favourable position if the disposition of the Government had not been thwarted and brought to confusion by the Opposition—that is the case upon which I am challenged. I am very glad to look into it and I will tell the House what I find. I find so far has it been from the fact that an exaggerated amount of time has been occupied with criticism during the session, the time so occupied has been relatively and absolutely insufficient. To begin with, let us consider this—was there reason for criticism, was there more or less ground for it this session? The occasion for it was unprecedented, just as the measures adopted for closing the mouth of the House of Commons were also beyond precedent. The Government were unable to settle their own policy in regard to two of the most important questions before us—namely, the fiscal question and the Army question. With regard to the public service, they were spending money like water without producing any justification. They are still groping about for the true function of the Army. No one has found it except the Secretary of State for War, who tells us that he feels, and knows, and sees exactly what ought to be done. Then why does he not tell us what ought to be done? That would save a great deal of the time of the Government, and would have saved a still larger amount of time if it had been done two or three months ago. Then, with regard to the Navy, a great deal of time has been spent in reconciling a two-Power standard of strength with three and a half-Power standard of expenditure. Then there are blunders like the Somaliland campaign, and such incidents as the adventure of the peaceful Mission to Tibet and the importation of Chinese labour. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh."] I am analysing the causes, and I am within my right. The real matter for criticism, however, is the presence of the right hon. Gentleman on that Bench, notwithstanding that they have lost, as we say and as they can hardly deny, the confidence of the country and also their due authority in this House. Look at their position. They are a band of fiscal reformers reduced to positive incoherence the moment any one gets up and tries to explain his views. That furnishes ground for criticism for nearly a whole session.

I have been speaking of the necessity, or excuse, or reason for criticism. Now let us come to the dimensions of it. One day has been allowed to a vote of censure on Chinese labour. Three Motions for the Adjournment of the House have been made from the Opposition Benches and two from the Government Benches. And these are the only inroads that have been made upon Government time. There have been private Motions possibly, but they have been in private Members' time. Let me dissect the session. Eighty-two days up to and including last Friday—the very number of days spent on the Home Rule Bill in Committee when strong measures were taken in 1892–93—eighty-two days have been at the disposal of the Government in whole or in part for their business. Of these two whole days and three evenings were devoted to criticism outside the usual routine in the way I have spoken of. Is it claimed that the vote of censure was wantonly or unnecessarily moved? No, Sir. The amendment of the Finance Bill took two days. Is this complained of? The two days spent on the consideration of the Finance Bill were just as much a part of the legislative work of the session as the days spent on the Licensing Bill itself. There was the usual debate on the Address, of which no complaint was made by right hon. Gentlemen. Two days of it were spent in discussing "the grave negligence and mismanagement of the Ministry, whereby the duration, magnitude, and cost of the war were greatly increased." That was the Motion of my hon. and learned friend the Member for South Shields. Was two days too long for a Motion of that importance, founded upon the Report of the Commission on the War, which had attracted universal attention and excited strong feeling in the country? At any rate, the Government and the late Colonial Secretary made two interesting contributions to that debate. They did not appear to resent it, but were rather glad of the opportunity of defending themselves. Two days were given to Chinese labour on the understanding laid down by the Government that this would be the only opportunity before the Ordinance took effect. Six days were spent in the forlorn hope of endeavouring to piece together into an intelligible and authoritative shape the conflicting and irreconcilable views of the distracted colleagues of the Prime Minister on the fiscal reform question. Was that time wasted? In one sense I admit it was wasted, because we did not succeed, after all, in arriving at a knowledge of what their policy was. That was not our fault. The reason of it was that a great question was suddenly and rashly raised and that the Government were found, after all, to have not only unsettled convictions, but conflicting and irreconcilable opinions. The natural consequence of that state of things was the occupation of a great part of Parliamentary time. But let me follow the time-table. There were fourteen days on the Address, three days on votes of censure, and three evenings on adjournments. That is twenty days, which leaves the Prime Minister sixty-two days, in whole or part, for Supply or legislation. Of these, four days, the same which he allows for the consideration in Committee of this most complicated and far-reaching Bill, were spent on the Supplementary Estimates, which the Government themselves introduced, which were on a scale absolutely without parallel and which really constituted, for the Army and Navy, a sort of new Army and Navy Budget. There were no obstructive tactics here. Is the right hon. Gentleman satisfied that the conduct of this Army business has been such as to disarm criticism? The time so spent was given to the country. If time was wasted it was owing to the manner in which information was either communicated in some part to, or withheld in the greatest part from, the House. The Licensing Bill could have been introduced before Easter, if it was ready, but it was evidently not ready. Six Bills came before the House—the Labourers (Ireland) Bill, Police Superannuation, Scotch Education, Penal Servitude, Aliens, and Dogs, those twin measures which seem to be complementary to each other, treating the dog as an alien and treating the alien as a dog. There was also a Bishopric Bill, and there was an innocent and uncontroversial Bill, which has yet to come on, called the

Local Authorities (Default) Bill. But how absurd to charge the Opposition with bringing about a waste of time, or at any rate such an expenditure of time as leads to a deadlock and makes closure by compartments on a Bill of first-class importance necessary, when dogs and aliens, bishops and Irish labourers, convicts, Scotch schools, and policemen were given priority! And when the Bill had got into Committee on 6th June, as we all remember, progress was suspended in order that stalwarts of the Government should be able to go to Ascot, and then, a little further on, it was again suspended in order that the tobacco trade should be able to recover from the confusion into which the Government had plunged it.

The Prime Minister has invited this scrutiny which I have given of the mode in which he has managed and distributed the time of the House. Is he proud of this leisurely, dilettante, haphazard conduct of business, with here a little and there a little, a nibble at this and then a bite at that? I do not think the record has been satisfactory, for that is not the way to force along business. The Government started with several episodes in their external policy which seemed to be incredible—at least, we cannot obtain from them a clear explanation or intelligible excuse—and with a great domestic revolution, for it is nothing less, put forward without rhyme or reason, on which they do not know their own mind. And then they complain, having begun in this way and having gone floundering and blundering along in the way I have described, forsooth, to the House and say that it is we who have driven them to the strong measures now to be employed. The whole responsibility is laid on the Opposition, and we are told that the credit of Parliament will be destroyed unless this measure, profoundly distasteful to at least very large sections of the people of this country, unheard of when the Government were put in power, unthought of even two years ago when they were dealing with this question of licensing, and on which we have just raised enough of the curtain in the few days that the Bill was in Committee to see how complex and serious are the questions it involves—that Parliament is to be discredited unless it is forced through this House without Amendment. The Government even this very day have put a number of new Amendments on the Paper in explanation of their views. I repudiate the responsibility the Government seek to put on us. It is not we who have allowed this or allowed that. It is the right hon. Gentleman who has managed the business of the House in a way which has led to this necessity. If this Bill had been a measure which we thought would be a good one, one likely to accomplish its object, and one which the people of this country desired, even then it would have been a strong order to invite us to treat a measure of that kind in this way. When, however, it is a Bill which we think will be disastrous to the country in its present shape, a Bill that will require immediate Amendment by Parliament, if it is passed, when opportunity offers—when that is the kind of Bill then, of course, we oppose this proceeding with the utmost willingness and with all the strength we possess. I have endeavoured to meet the right hon. Gentleman's plea, not, I can well imagine, to his satisfaction, but, at any rate, to the information of a good many people who heard the plea urged—and when that plea which he has put forward is so wrapt up in his own conduct of the business of the House we are entitled to explain to the country that we have no art nor part in this proceeding, and shall discharge our duty in voting against the Motion he has brought forward. This proceeding, while it will do no credit either to the Government which proposes it, or the Parliament which adopts it, will also tend to strengthen the public opinion as to the reputation of the Government in whose favour it is made.

Mr. BELL (Derby) said he did not think any one in this House could charge him with having obstructed the Government in any debate. During the discussion he had got up on several occasions but was unsuccessful in catching the eye of either the Speaker or the Chairman of Committees. He had not complained of that, because in most instances some one else had spoken what was in his mind. But he could not allow this Motion to go by without expressing, during the few minutes at his disposal, his opinion, humble as it might be, but which he knew had the support of his constituents. He had always held in great esteem the Prime Minister, and believed the right hon. Gentleman to be a man of great sincerity, although he had not always agreed with him in all the right hon. Gentleman had said and done. But that conviction had been dispelled out of his mind, because he really believed that the right hon. Gentleman was not sincere in thrusting this Bill down the throats of the hon. Members and the country. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh, oh!"] Hon. Members might dissent, but he had a right to enjoy his opinion as they had theirs. He felt strongly on this question. While this was a Bill to compensate brewers for putting arsenic in their beer, it made no provision to give compensation to those who were poisoned by drinking their beer. The number of days and hours set apart for the Bill was certainly, in his opinion, insufficient to adequately discuss a measure of this magnitude and importance. He agreed with the right hon. Member for West Birmingham for once, that when he was on that side of the House in opposition, and the Liberals were in power, if the Liberal Party adopted such a monstrous proposal as this, he would join with the right hon. Member for West Birmingham in opposing it. At any rate, in the experience he had had, he had never known any Party, either Tory or Liberal, to have done anything of this kind in thrusting a Bill of this character down the throats of hon. Members with insufficient discussion. He wanted to make it distinctly clear that he would only be a passive resister that night, and should vote against the closure; but he would become a very active resister after that night and should take no part in closure by compartments. [MINISTERIAL interruptions and cries of "Oh, oh!"] He did not say that with a view of convincing hon. Members opposite, because many of them were convinced of the advantages of a Bill which would put money into their own pockets. [MINISTERIAL ironical laughter.] Hon. Gentlemen might laugh, but he had his convictions, and he hoped he understood a little bit, as well as some people who were interested, what the position really was. He had listened to a great many debates in this House, and he recognised that it was sometimes necessary to have the closure, but only after some reasonable time had been given to the discussion of the point at issue. But insufficient time had been given for the discussion of this Bill, and whatever might be the consequences he would not allow the closure by compartments to be enforced without some active resistance, and he hoped they would let the country know that there were some persons in this House who had some regard to the dignity of Parliament. The Prime Minister had reduced the House to a very undignified position.

And, it being midnight, Mr. SPEAKER proceeded to interrupt the business.

Whereupon Mr. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided; Ayes, 303; Noes, 223. (Division List No. 187.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, AugustusHenryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster,Rt.Hn.Hugh O
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hn.Sir H.
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt.Hon. A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T.(Windsor)
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Mich. Hicks
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Lt.-Col.H.F(Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts,W.
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt.Hon.J.(Birm.
Chamberlain,Rt Hn.J.A(Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh

Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Rt.Hon. Sir John C.R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.)
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir HoratioD.(Chatham
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale, Rt.Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir FredDixon
Dorington, Rt.Hn. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt.Hn.Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B.(Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson, Rt.Hn.SirJ(Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn)
Gordon, Maj. E. (T'r Hamlets)
Gore, Hon. S.F.Ormsby-(Linc.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green, Walford D.(Wednesbury
Greene, Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, RtHn LordG(Midd'x
Hamilton, Marq of(L'nd'nderry
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton(Tynem'th)
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R.(Dulwich)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A.(Stafford,W.)
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, Jn.(Kent, Faversham)
Howard, J.(Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kennaway, Rt.Hn.Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.(Salop.
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John G.(Yorks., N.R.)
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W.(Evesham)
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Iver, Sir Lewis(Edinburgh,W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W.F.
Maxwell, RtHn.Sir H.E(Wigt'n
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, Jn. Throgmorton
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell, William (Burnley)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Peel, Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, S.Forde(Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt.Hn.Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, SirHarryS(Limehouse)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Saunderson, Rt.Hn.Col.Edw.J.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Smith, H C(North'mb.Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur(Ormskirk)
Stanley, Edward Jas.(Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)

Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G(Oxf'dUniv.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col.SirC.E.H(Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E(Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G.E.(Notts.
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wills, Sir Frederick
Wilson, A.Stanley (Yorks, E.R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H.(Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W.H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Channing, Francis Allston
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice,Capt E.C(SAndrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans, Sir Fran. H.(Maidstone)
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt.Hn. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt,Lewis V. (Rossendale
Harcourt,RtHn.SirW(Monm'th
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Hobhouse, C.E.H. (Bristol, E.)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, VincentP.(Cavan,W.
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal,W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leamy, Edmund
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (Accrington)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh,N.)
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt.Hn. John (Montrose
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James(Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, William
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Reid, Sir R. Threshie(Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)

Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Seely, Maj.J.E.B.(Isleof Wight
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A.(Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomas,J A(Glamorgan,Gower
Tillet, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton, J. Lawson (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, JohnCathcart(Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull,W.)
Wilson, Fred. W.(Norfolk,Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh.,N.)
Woodhouse,Sir J.T(Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Bell and Mr. Henderson.

Question put accordingly, "That the words 'the proceedings' stand part of the Question."

The House divided; Ayes, 301; Noes, 228. (Division List No. 188.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus HenryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster,Rt.Hn.Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hon.SirH.
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. JoscelineFitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C.B.(Hornsey)
Balfour,RtHnGeraldW.(Leeds)
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry,Sir Francis T.(Windsor)
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Beach,Rt.Hn.Sir MichaelHicks
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles,Lt.Col.H. F. (Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish,V. C.W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A. (Worc
Chaplin,Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb,Rt. Hn. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig,Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd(Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale,Rt.Hon.Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland,SirFred Dixon
Dorington,Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir WilliamTheodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants,W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson,Rt.Hn.Sir J.(Manc'r
Finch,Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir RobertBannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Haye
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy,Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster,Philip S.(Warwick,S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon,Hn.J.E. (Elgin&Nairn)
Gordon,Maj Evans-(T'rH'mlets
Gore,Hon. S. F. Ormsby (Linc.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green,Walford D.(Wednesbury
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene,W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton,RtHn LordG.(Middx
Hamilton,Marq.of (L'nd'nderry
Hardy,Laurence (Kent,Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton(Tynem'th)
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R. (Dulwich)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath,Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords, N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson,Sir A.(Stafford,W.)
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry

Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, John (Kent, Favers'm
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kennaway, Rt.Hn.Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hon.Geo.T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar(Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F.(Liverpool)
Lawson,John Grant(Yorks.NR
Lee,Arthur H. (Hants,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col.Charles W.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter (Bristol,S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C.(Cumb.,Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas,Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Iver,Sir Lewis(Edinburgh W
M'Killop,James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell,RtHnSir H.E.(Wigt'n
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H.M.
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell, William (Burnley)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu,Hon.J.Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan,DavidJ.(Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt HnA. Graham(Bute
Murray,Charles J.(Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Peel,Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley,S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie,Rt.Hn. Chas.Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel,Sir HarryS.(Limehouse
Sandys, Lieut.-Col.Thos.Myles
Saunderson, Rt.Hn.Col.Edw.J.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith,Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith,James Parker(Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W.Bromwich)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley,Edward Jas.(Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,Rt.Hn. J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff. Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.Sir C E H(Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby,Lt.-Col.A. C. E.(Taunt'n
Welby,SirCharles G. E.(Notts.)
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Wharton, Rt. Hon. JohnLloyd
Whiteley,H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wills, Sir Frederick
Wilson,A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, SirW.H.(Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, HenryWilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood
and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Channing, Francis Allston
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William

Cullinan, J,
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M.Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin,CharlesRamsay(Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M.(Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Capt EC(S.Andrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans,SirFrancisH.(Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hain, Edward
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt,Lewis V.(Rossendale
Harcourt,RtHn SirW(Monm'th
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt.Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hobhouse, C.E.H.(Bristol, E.)
Hobhouse,RtHnH.(Somers't,E
Holland,Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutchinson,Dr. Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones,DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy,Vincent P.(Cavan,W.
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leamy, Edmund
Leese,Sir JosephF.(Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M‘Crae, George
M‘Fadden, Edward
M‘Hugh, Patrick A.
M‘Kean, John
M‘Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M'Laren, Sir CharlesBenjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Middlemore,John Throgmorton
Mitchell,Edw. (Fermanagh,N.)
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley,Rt. Hn. John (Montrose
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor,James(Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, William
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W,)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, James(Roscommon,N
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Reid,Sir R.Threshie(Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Samuel, S.M. (Whitechapel)
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Seely,Maj.J.E.B.(Isle of Wight
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Smith,HC.(North'mb.Tyneside
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C.(Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas,David Alfred(Merthyr
Thomas,JA (Glamorgan,Gower
Tillet, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton,John Lawson (Leeds,S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason,John Cathcart(Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York,W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Chas.Henry (Hull, W.)
Wilson,Fred.W.(Norfolk, Mid.)
Wilson, Henry J.(York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson,J.W.(Worcestersh.N.)
Woodhouse,SirJT. (Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and
Mr. William M'Arthur.

Main Question again proposed.

And, it being after Midnight, and objection being taken to further Proceeding, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed to-morrow.

Adjourned at twenty-three minutes before One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 5th July, 1904.

LORD HENNIKER.

Report made from the Lord Chancellor that the right of Charles Henry Chandos Henniker-Major, Baron Henniker in the Peerage of Ireland, to vote at the election of Representative Peers for Ireland has been established to the satisfaction of the Lord Chancellor; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have not been complied with:—London County Council (General Powers).

The same was ordered to lie on the Table.

Leyton Urban District Council Bill. Report from His Majesty's Attorney-General received, and ordered to lie on the Table.

Thurles Urban District Council Water Bill. Reported, with Amendments.

London United Tramways Bill. Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, no parties having appeared in opposition thereto; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The orders made on the 16th and 21st of June last discharged, and Bill committed for Thursday next.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next.

Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, no parties having appeared in opposition thereto; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The orders made on the 14th and 21st of June last discharged, and Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next.

Leith Corporation Tramways Order Confirmation Bill. Report from the Joint Committee that the Bill ought to be allowed to proceed; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

Melrose District Water Order Confirmation Bill. Brought from the Commons.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (Birmingham) Bill [H.L.]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to.

Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill; Brymbo Water Bill; Great Central and Midland Joint Railways Bill; Humber Commercial Railway and Dock Bill; Southend-on-Sea Gas Bill. Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. House in Committee (according to order). The Amendments proposed by the Select Committee made. Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received on Thursday next.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [H.L.]. House in Committee (according to order). The Amendments proposed by the Select Committee made; further Amendments made. Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received on Thursday next.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [H. L.]. Amendments reported (according to order), and Bills to be read 3ª on Thursday next.

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]. House in Committee (according to order). Amendments made. Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received on Thursday next.

Melrose District Water Order Confirmation Bill. Read 1ª; to be printed; and (pursuant to the Private Legislation

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899), deemed to have been read 2^a (The Lord Kintore (*E. Kintore*)), and reported from the Committee. (No. 130.)

PETITION.

SUPPLY OF ELECTRICITY BILL [H.L.].

Petition to be heard by Counsel for Amendment of; of Electric Supply Companies; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3202. United States (Chicago); No. 3203. Venezuela (Caracas).

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

DEAN FOREST BILL.

Order of yesterday referring the Bill to the Examiners discharged; and Bill to be printed. (No. 131.)

RE-VACCINATION BILL [H.L.].

Reported from the Standing Committee without further Amendment. The Report of the Amendment made in Committee of the Whole House to be received on Thursday next.

RAILWAYS (PRIVATE SIDINGS) BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

LORD WOLVERTON: My Lords, this is a very short Bill containing only two clauses, and it has passed through all its stages in the other House. The general idea of the Bill is to put back the law into the position which we always thought it occupied. It has always been considered that it was the law that facilities should be granted by the railway companies to traders and others owning private sidings. This idea has been rather rudely shaken by two decisions of the Courts in England and Scotland, and this Bill has been framed to put back the law into the position which we considered it previously occupied.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a."—(*Lord Wolverton.*)

On Question, Bill read 2^a, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House, on Friday next.

HALL-MARKING OF FOREIGN PLATE BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

THE EARL OF LYTTON: My Lords, I need detain your Lordships but a very few moments in explaining this Bill. Its object briefly is to secure that the mark which is required by the existing law to be placed upon all articles of gold and silver plate imported from foreign countries shall be of so distinctive a character as to fulfil the purposes which it was originally intended to serve. A casual glance at this Bill might perhaps lead some of your Lordships to imagine that it was an attempt to give some advantage to British over foreign-made plate. Such an opinion as that would be altogether erroneous. The Bill, it is true, has the support of, and is, indeed, largely promoted by the traders of Birmingham and Sheffield; but, nevertheless, it has no connection, however remote, with the now famous fiscal policy of Birmingham, or even with the milder, though not less famous, policy of Sheffield. If it had, I should not now be asking your Lordships to give it a Second Reading.

The law at the present moment is as follows. By an Act of Parliament passed in the year 1876 all gold and silver plate which is imported from foreign countries, and which is taken to an assay office to be stamped, has placed upon it the letter F in an oval shield to denote that it is of foreign origin. The Act which enforces this regulation distinctly laid down the objects for impressing this letter. It was stated that the object was to denote that such gold and silver plate was imported from foreign ports, and not wrought or made in the United Kingdom. But this letter

F has not been found to be sufficiently distinctive in character, because it is very easily confused with either the initial of the manufacturer of the plate, or even with the letter which denotes the year in which the plate was marked. Your Lordships will know that there are letters frequently placed upon gold and silver plate; this letter F is very easily confused with one of those letters, and the hall-mark which is placed upon articles of plate and was originally intended merely to denote the quality of the plate, has now been generally looked upon as an indication of British manufacture. The result of this is that large quantities of gold and silver plate of foreign origin have been imported into this country, and having received an hall-mark at an Assay Office in this country, have been sold in this country, and even exported to other countries and there sold, as plate of British manufacture. In other words, my Lords, the object of the Act of 1876 has not been carried out, and it is the intention of this Bill to remedy that particular matter.

There is no new principle involved in this Bill. No plate which is not obliged to be marked at present will have to receive a mark in future. In fact, the only result of the passing of this Bill will be that what has in the past been done inadequately will in the future be done adequately. The precise mark which in future is to be placed upon imported gold and silver plate is to be decided by an Order in Council, because it is a very technical matter, and no doubt the decision will ultimately be arrived at after consultation with the Assay officers and the members of the trade. One word as to the history of the Bill. The Bill was introduced last year into the House of Commons, and in March of that year a very large and influential deputation, representing the traders of London, Birmingham, and Sheffield, waited upon the President of the Board of Trade to urge its claims. The principle was accepted by the Government, and the Bill has since been redrafted under the direct supervision of the Board of Trade. It has been introduced into the House of Commons again this year, and has passed through all its stages, and in its present form it receives the support of all the members engaged in the gold and silver trade in this country. The Association of Chambers of Commerce has passed a resolution in its favour, as also have the trades unions in this country. In fact, the Bill has the support both of the masters and of the men. In those circumstances I feel sure your Lordships will not hesitate to read it a second time.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a."—(*The Earl of Lytton.*)

On Question, Bill read 2^a, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Friday next.

YEOMANRY WEAPONS.

LORD ASHBURTON: My Lords, I rise to ask the Under-Secretary of State for War whether in deciding upon a second weapon for the Yeomanry regiments due consideration will be given to the fact that, while fully armed for fighting on foot, they require a weapon for use when mounted and carrying out the work of scouting and patrolling, in the execution of which they would be liable to sudden attack by those of the enemy's forces engaged in the same duties.

I have to ask your Lordships' indulgence on rising to address the House for the first time. About six weeks ago a Question was asked relating to the Yeomanry by a noble Lord who served with great distinction in South Africa, and who is now in command of one of the newly raised Scottish Yeomanry regiments. Out of that Question a somewhat long debate arose, in which the necessity for a second weapon for the Yeomanry was freely mentioned. I think the consensus of opinion in your Lordships' House was entirely in favour of such a weapon. I cannot help thinking at the same time that the main factor in deciding what that weapon should be was rather overlooked. The Yeomanry are now, like the Regular cavalry, trained to fight on foot, and for their foot work they cannot want a better weapon than the one they have got—the long-range magazine rifle. But they are taught other duties which I venture to think are even more important than their foot work—namely, those of scouting and patrolling.

The Yeomanry, though they are now a kind of mounted rifles, described by Sir John French as a "form of cavalry," are in reality, I think, the cavalry of the Auxiliary Forces, and on them, whenever the time should come for our Militia and infantry to be placed on the footing of active service, much of the scouting and patrolling would fall. If that patrolling is to be of the kind described by the present Inspector-General of Cavalry in India as "Blind-man's-dog scouting," then it is a waste of time to have it; but if, on the other hand, the scouting and patrolling is to be efficiently carried out, it will carry with it not the risk but the certainty of frequent hostile collisions with small bodies of the enemy. We cannot hope, I suppose, for the second time to be fighting a nation who will have no weapon except the rifle. You may take it for granted that whenever we are at war again the enemy's scouting will be done by men armed with other weapons than the rifle. In a wooded country the land lends itself to such fights; they will be short, and, if the Yeomanry are left as they are at present, I do not see what they can be expected to do.

It is now nearly three years since the war ended, and the Yeomanry are in just the same position as they were then. They have only one weapon. When the noble and gallant Earl the late Commander-in-Chief spoke in the debate to which I refer, he told your Lordships that he was unable to remember why the issue of bayonets was discontinued to the Yeomanry. I think I may say with some confidence that 90 per cent. of the Yeomanry are deeply grateful to the person or the circumstances that caused that issue to cease, for a more unpopular weapon I do not think you could devise for the Yeomanry, and at the same time it would be an absolutely useless weapon. If it comes to bayonet work such as we have heard of in Manchuria, you cannot expect dismounted cavalry to compete with infantry. Masses of Yeomanry on foot would have very short shrift at the hands of trained infantry.

The noble and gallant Earl seemed to be in favour of bayonets and against swords, but I should like to suggest that there are swords and swords. I am no advocate of the present sword. It is an ill-balanced weapon, it has a cutting edge, and it requires no little skill to properly handle. It has the great disadvantage of requiring a considerable amount of instruction and an enormous amount of practice before a man can even be considered a fair swordsman; but because this particular type of sword is not a satisfactory one I fail to see that it is beyond the powers of the military authorities to design a weapon which, while being perfectly efficient, would be much simplified, and the use of which would be more easily acquired, The weapon that would be an ideal one for the Yeomanry would be one about the length, perhaps a trifle longer, of the present naval cutlass without a cutting edge and merely a point, but with the same hilt. It would only require very simple sword exercise, and if the Yeomanry were armed with such a weapon and with the rifle they have now they would be sufficiently armed for any work they might be called upon to do, I see no objection, if necessary, why that weapon should not be able to be fixed on the end of the rifle, provided that such means of attachment in no way interfered with its efficient use as a weapon for unmounted fighting for which it would, of course, be specially designed.

The amount of dissatisfaction that exists in the Yeomanry now on the subject of their armament and equipment, I do not think is realised in quarters where it would be well that it should be. In common with many other Yeomanry officers, I attach very serious importance to our half-armed condition at present, and I hope the noble Earl the Under-Secretary of State for War will be able to give some assurance that the question of the helpless condition of the Yeomanry will receive that consideration at the hands of the authorities which I venture to think it deserves; and that no attempt will be made to turn the Yeomanry into a miserably bad mounted infantry by forcing that unpopular weapon, the bayonet, upon them.

LORD WILLOUGHBY DE BROKE: My Lords, I desire to associate myself with the remarks which have just fallen from the noble Lord. I was one of those who were very pleased to hear, in the course of the debate the other day, that the Yeomanry were going to be armed with a second weapon, but I must confess to a certain amount of alarm when I heard that it was going to take the shape of the bayonet, and for the same reason which the noble Lord has just brought forward. I should like, as a humble member of the Yeomanry, to join him in requesting the noble Earl the Under-Secretary to favourably consider the sword in preference to the bayonet. I venture to submit that the bayonet is not a weapon which can be used by a man on horseback. We were also told during the course of the debate on the Yeomanry not very long ago that the Yeomanry were not primarily intended for service abroad, and that in the event of invasion, which I suppose is improbable, their principal use would be in this country. I venture to submit that for a mounted man a sword in his hand would be a very much more useful weapon than anything else.

It may be urged against the use of the sword by Yeomanry regiments that we should not have time to learn the sword exercise. Well, my Lords, in the old days before the Boer War, and before our swords were taken away from us, we used to cut the sword exercise. It was cut, you will say, with a blunt-edged weapon, but still the sword exercise was learnt with a considerable degree of efficiency, and I should like to call your attention to the fact that we now have almost three times the amount of training that we had before. We have fourteen working days in camp, and each officer and each man in our regiment, at any rate, attended five preliminary mounted drills before the Yeomanry assembled in camp. Therefore, I think we should have plenty of time in which to learn at any rate a modified form of the sword exercises. I should also like to ask the noble Earl the Under-Secretary if he could give us some kind of assurance as to the position as a mounted force that the Yeomanry are going to occupy, whether we are to be cavalry or mounted infantry, or something between the two.

It may be that different conditions of service may be suitable to different regiments. For instance, Lord Lovat's Scouts may possibly desire to be treated as mounted infantry, although I cannot speak for them. But there are certain Midland regiments which have always been cavalry ever since they were started, and which could produce a squadron of at least 100 or 120 men accustomed to ride across country, who I venture to assert would be quite equal to undertaking any of the functions of a cavalry regiment. The whole essence of these Midland regiments, is, in the first instance, their cavalry character. There are officers and men in those regiments who would never have dreamt of joining the Militia or Volunteers, but who joined the Yeomanry because it was mainly connected with horsemanship and riding, and because there was a prospect of doing the work mounted. For that reason I sincerely trust nothing more will be done to diminish the cavalry character of such regiments. I should like to respectfully assure the noble Earl that any attempt to whittle away the cavalry character of these regiments will be most unpopular with all ranks.

*THE EARL OF LONSDALE: My Lords, I do not wish to detain the House for many minutes, but on an occasion like this, when the weapon of the Yeomanry is concerned, I cannot refrain from asking your Lordships, as an Officer-in-Command of Yeomanry, to do all in your power to prevent the introduction of such a weapon as the bayonet into the Yeomanry. Anyone who is accustomed to the use of the rifle knows the absolute balance in its use, and anybody understanding horsemanship must realise that no one, however fine a horseman he may be, is capable of using a rifle with a bayonet attached to the end of it when it comes to lungeing. In fact I very much doubt if even a Sandow could use it. We have seen contests at various military competitions — sword versus lance, sword versus bayonet – but I do not know if any of your Lordships have ever witnessed a competition as between a rifle with a bayonet attached to it and a sword, the mounted competitor having the rifle. I have seen it twice, and each time it has ended in serious discomfort to the horseman, for it is absolutely impossible after lungeing for him to recover himself, and a defy even a Sandow to manipulate a horse with a rifle, having a bayonet at the end of it, in his hand. When the whole secret of Yeomanry and Cavalry is dependent on the absolute balance of the man, whatever his weapon may be, with a view of remaining fixed in the saddle, it is obvious that such a weapon would be most prejudicial to Yeomanry, and it is for this reason I ask your Lordships to persuade the authorities not to introduce the bayonet as a second weapon into the Yeomanry.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The Earl of DONOUGHMORE): My Lords, I think your Lordships will have gathered from the character of the debate that I am not being asked by the three noble Lords who have addressed your Lordships to give a final decision on this subject to-night. The matter is under consideration. In fact, I spent some time discussing it with three of my colleagues this morning, and I can assure your Lordships that it has not been lost sight of. I hope a decision will be announced in another place at an early date. I can only repeat what I have said before. Although the three noble Lords who have addressed your Lordships this evening advocated the same view, I am sure your Lordships will admit that there are very many different opinions as to what the second arm for the Yeomanry should be. I addressed your Lordships at some length on that point the other day in the debate initiated by Lord Lovat, and I do not intend to repeat the arguments I then tried to lay before your Lordships. All sorts of weapons have been recommended to us, and all sorts of variations of every weapon have been recommended, and I sincerely hope we may be able to hit upon something which will be satisfactory, if not to all parties, at any rate to most parties, and I can assure the noble Lord who raised this question to-day that we are very anxious to come to a final settlement upon the point.

I now come to the point raised by the noble Lord on the Cross Benches (Lord Willoughby de Broke). He is extremely anxious that nothing should be done, more especially in connection with the corps in the Midlands, to decrease what he calls their cavalry character. I can assure the noble Lord that we have no intention of any action that could lead to that end. Your Lordships will, of course, understand that there are town corps and country corps of Yeomanry. The country corps generally consist of good riders, and not very good shots, when they are recruits, and the town corps generally consist of not very good riders and not very good shots, but still, as a rule, their shooting is better than their riding when they first come; and our desire is to train these two classes to reach as high a standard as they possibly can in both these considerations. Our efforts naturally in the country corps are concentrated more on rifle shooting than on riding, and *vice versa*.

LORD TWEEDMOUTH: My Lords, it may seem somewhat presumptuous in me to interpose in this discussion in a House where so many of your Lordships are professionally acquainted with the matter before us, but I do think this House will be doing a good service in turning its attention for a short time this evening to this question of how you are going to arm your mounted troops in the future, and how those arms are to be carried. For my own part, I quite agree with what has fallen from the noble Lords who have spoken, that as a weapon for mounted men the bayonet is ridiculous. It is all very well to have a bayonet, no doubt, for a man to use if he is acting as an infantry soldier, but it is ridiculous to say that a bayonet can be of any use to a man on horseback. I have seen a very ingenious invention by which the great part of the stock of the rifle was cut away in order that the man might get a better grip of the rifle and use it at arm's length as a lance, but I agree that it would require a Sandow to use a weapon of that sort with any success.

The question we have to consider is, is it not right that mounted men, now that they are used so very much in a double capacity, sometimes on horseback and sometimes on foot, should at least have one weapon suitable for each position? I think most people will agree to that, and I think that the idea which we sometimes see portrayed in the illustrated papers, of a gallant mounted infantryman galloping full speed, with his reins loose on the horse's neck and his rifle up to his shoulder taking aim, is quite impossible in modern warfare. It is possible to use the carbine on horseback, but if it is to be used effectively it must be sufficiently short to be used in one hand as a pistol. I remember many years ago, when there were still buffalo in the United States, that I killed a number of buffalo with a carbine used in that way; it is far better than any revolver that was ever invented. What is the weapon you are going to give to your mounted man? The two suggested are the lance and the sword. It seems to me that directly you give your mounted man a rifle the question of a lance drops out, because I do not see how a man can carry a rifle and a lance as well. Therefore, you are tied up at once to the sword. I believe that the sword should be such an one as Lord Ashburton suggested, and that it should be attached to the saddle so that it should be essentially a weapon which the man would rely upon on horseback to use from the horse.

Then we come to the question of the rifle and how it is to be carried. It seems to me one of the most extraordinary incidents of the whole of the rearmament of our forces that a shortened rifle should have been adopted for the purpose of being handed to every mounted man—for that was the object of shortening the rifle—and that the manufacture of hundreds of thousands of shortened rifles should have been entered upon before any decision had been come to as to the manner in which that rifle was to be carried on horseback. All sorts of methods have been tried. A very distinguished general officer at Aldershot told me the other day that they were at their wits' ends to find a way of carrying this new rifle on horseback, and I have seen a number of the new rifles that have been so carried very much damaged by the operation. My Aldershot friend leans to carrying the rifle in a bucket on the saddle in the same way as the old carbine was carried, but that is not so easily done. Noble Lords who have tried it will not have found it so easy as in the case of the old carbine, and, if you fix your rifle in a bucket on the saddle, then, supposing your man is dismounted, both his sword and his rifle are left on the saddle, and he is without any arm at all.

I think a method of carrying the rifle or carbine should be decided upon which would allow of its being attached to the man, so that when he is dismounted he has a weapon with him, and that weapon the one which it is most convenient for him to use when on foot. I have another witness to call with regard to the question of carrying the rifle. A very capable cavalry officer writes to me—

> "We have not yet discovered how we are to carry the new rifle. We have been supplied with shoes to fit on the saddle, but the rifle is too short to carry with the sling and shoe."

I understood that that was the great object of shortening the rifle, that you were to be able to carry it with a lance attachment and in a lance shoe. The extraordinary result of shortening the rifle has been that you cannot carry it in this way because the rifle is too short. This officer continues—

> "I hear the cavalry at Aldershot are carrying them slung on their backs with their butt in the shoe, which must be very dangerous and uncomfortable. They complain of having lost a lot of bolts. A bucket to carry the new rifle is too clumsy for words."

My point is that it is an extraordinary thing that you should invent a new rifle for the express purpose of supplying to the cavalry, that you should shorten your rifle throughout the whole British Army and re-issue it to the cavalry, without making up your minds in which way it is to be carried by horsemen. I think the House may well give a little more time to this question, and I hope the result will be that our mounted men may be given an arm suitable to be used on horseback and another arm to be used on foot, and that both may be carried in a convenient way for man and beast.

*EARL ROBERTS: My Lords, as I have had something to say on this question of the rifle, the sword, and the bayonet, perhaps it will not be out of place if I make a few remarks on this occasion. When we went to South Africa the cavalry were armed with the carbine and sword or lance, as the case might be, or both. A very short time after I arrived out there I received a request from the officer commanding the 18th Hussars asking that his men should be given the rifle. He said that the carbine was practically useless against the Boer Mauser, and he hoped that his regiment might be given rifles. I was able to meet the request, and in a very short time all the other officers commanding cavalry regiments followed this officer's example and begged that their men should be given rifles too. Consequently rifles were given to them. I cannot understand how, if the cavalry found the carbine useless when on service, anyone can possibly propose that they should be armed with it now.

Before the war began a Committee was sitting to see whether the existing rifle could not be made a little handier for general purposes by being made lighter and a little shorter. That Committee did not conclude its proceedings until the war was over, but when I came back to England I remembered that the cavalry had all begged they might have the rifle. It seemed that if this proposal, which had been made before the war began, that the rifle should be shortened could be carried out, it would be as well to have a rifle which would do for infantry and cavalry alike. That was the origin of the shorter rifle. It is as effective in every respect as the long one; it has the advantage of being 5-in. shorter and a pound lighter; and for cavalry purposes, therefore, it is more convenient. As to the question of how the rifle should be carried, the carbine has now a sling attached to it, so that it can be worn across a man's shoulders when on service. It is, of course, only on service that it is necessary that it should be thus carried, but, as the noble Lord has said, it is then essential.

In Afghanistan on one occasion I had about two squadrons of the 9th Lancers numbering about 195 men, and on 11th December, 1879, when we were fighting beyond Kabul, the 9th Lancers were a great deal engaged, and lost a great many horses and a fair number of men. But what surprised me was to find that they had lost more than forty carbines. On inquiry I found that this was due to the fact that the carbine was carried in the bucket, and that when the horse was shot and fell over the weapon was lost. I saw many of the men on foot in this predicament, their sword was dangling between their legs, their lance was in their hands, and they were trying to recover the carbine from the horse. I immediately gave orders that the swords should be attached to the saddle, and that the carbine should be carried on the trooper's back. That did not find favour for many years in this country, and has not up to the present moment; but I believe that it is now to be settled that the carbine shall be carried in the bucket in peace time and in a sling across the back in war time. The proper place for the sword is, no doubt, on the saddle. I would observe, however, that, if the Yeomanry are given the sword, it is essential that they should learn how to use it. I remember hearing a story in the war of some Yeomanry who were chasing a Boer. They overtook him, and the Boer fell down, and they began to slash at him with their swords. Not very much damage was done, and one officer said, "Shoot the poor devil." Then the Boer, who said nothing so long as they merely hacked at him with their swords, called out, "Don't shoot me, Sir." When they proposed to shoot him he begged for his life. Therefore, if the Yeomanry are given swords they should know how to use them, and unless they have sufficient time to learn their use it would be no good giving them swords. I only made these observations in order to tell your Lordships why the cavalry are now given the rifle and why it is difficult to give the sword to men unless they learn how to use it.

THE CHINESE IN THE TRANSVAAL.

Lord COLERIDGE: My Lords, I desire to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies how many Chinese labourers of those hitherto imported into South Africa under the Chinese Labour Importation Ordinance can demand the importation of wife or children, under Clause 33 of the Regulations, and the numbers of such wives and children respectively. I would only remind the noble Duke that it was a week ago that he promised me this information. He said he would telegraph to Hong-kong to obtain it. I refrain from making any observations until I have heard the answer of my noble friend.

The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for the COLONIES (The Duke of **Marlborough**): My Lords, I do not think I need detain your Lordships more than a minute or two in replying to the Question of the noble and learned Lord. As the noble and learned Lord has reminded us, on 28th June he asked me to find out from Hong-kong the number of Chinese labourers who had registered their wives and families. In pursuance of my promise to the noble and learned Lord a telegram was sent off on the 29th ultimo to the Acting Governor of Hong-kong, and the reply we have received from him is to this effect, that out of the first batch of Chinese who went over to South Africa on the "Tweeddale," which I think had on board nearly 1,000, 308 had registered their names as being anxious to have their wives and families sent out to them; that is to say, over a third of the total number in the first ship registered their names and will be able to have their wives and families sent over to them at some future date. I think, in view of this fact, that the doubts and misgivings which I detected in the mind of the noble and learned Lord on the last occasion the subject was mentioned must be entirely removed.

House adjourned at twenty minutes past Five o'clock, to Thursday next, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 5th July, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [Lords] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. **Speaker** laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—Belfast Corporation (Tramways) Bill [Lords]; Manchester Corporation (General Powers) Bill [Lords]. Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

Minehead Urban District Council Water Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

St. Mary Woolnoth Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

Filey Improvement Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Maidenhead Bridge Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; an Amendment made; Bill to be read the third time.

Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill. Lords Amendment considered, and agreed to.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill. Consideration, as amended, deferred till Friday.

Glasgow Corporation (Police) Order Confirmation Bill. Read a second time; to be considered upon Thursday.

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed.

STANDING ORDERS.

Resolution reported from the Select Committee; "That, in the case of the County of Suffolk Bill, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with:—That the Bill be permitted to proceed, provided that the consent of the holders of securities given by the Joint Committee of the Counties of East and West Suffolk be proved before the Committee on the Bill, and that the notices for the

Bill be published in the *London Gazette* and in the local newspapers.

Resolution agreed to.

Loch Leven Water Power Bill. Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill. Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered upon Friday, and to be printed. [Bill 258.]

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP L).

Mr. AGG-GARDNER reported from the Committee on Group L of Private Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Thursday, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—London County Council (Money) Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to—Matlock and District Gas Bill [Lords]; Ticehurst and District Water and Gas Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

Leith Corporation Tramways Order Confirmation Bill. Reported from the Joint Committee, without Amendment [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Minutes of Proceedings to be printed. [No. 240.]

Bill to be read the third time upon Thursday.

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; from Aberdeen; Aldcliffe; Alston; Barnsley; Barnstaple; Beaminster; Bethnal Green (two); Blackburn; Bournbrook; Bradford; Brentwood; Bridport; Briercliffe; Broome; Burgh St. Peter; Carlisle (fourteen); Cheadle; Clifton; Colne; Cripplegate; Crook; Dewsbury; Dilhorne; Gillingham; Hackney (three); Halling; Halstead; Hardley; Hetton-le-Hole; Hitchin; Hornsey; Hoxton; Huby; Hucknall; Huggate; Hugglescote; Ipstones; Ipswich; Kidderminster; Kirby Cane; Kiveton Park; Lambton Park; Leigh on Mendip; Leven; Lewes; Lidlington; Lodge Lane; London; Lye; Manchester; Morecambe; Moreton Morrell; Motherwell; Mount Gretna; Nelson (eight); Newcastle-on-Tyne; Newport; New Row; North Hill; North Walsham; Nottingham (two); Nuneaton; Oldham; Padiham (two); Pendleton; Pitsmoor; Potton; Puncknowle; Richmond; Sheerness; Sheffield; Sneinton; Stamford Hill; Stantonbury; Ston Easton; Stratford on Avon; Stromness; Sunderland; Tannochside; Tean; Toxteth; Trowbridge (two); Upper Clapton; Uppermill; Upper Tooting; Wellesbourne; Whalley; Widcombe; Wiltshire; Winnothdale; Woodburn; and Woollfold; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Chichester; and King's Lynn; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF BUTTER BILL.

Petition from Dumfries, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF WHISKEY BILL.

Petition from Dumfries, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

TUBERCULOSIS (ANIMALS) COMPENSATION BILL.

Petition from the Royal, Parliamentary, and Police Burghs of Scotland, against; to lie upon the Table.

TEINDS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Dumfries, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

VALUATION BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Chertsey; Dudley; Hoo; Lancaster; and Newhaven; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

ST. LOUIS EXHIBITION (STATISTICAL TABLES).

Copy presented, of Charts (reduced in size) illustrating the Statistics of Trade, Employment, and Conditions of Labour in the United Kingdom prepared for the St. Louis Exhibition by the Commercial, Labour, and Statistical Department of the Board of Trade [by Command]; to lie upon the Table

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 5) BILL.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 4th July; *Mr. Bonar Law*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 239.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Admiralty Shipbuilding Programme—Balance of Orders.

MR. J. F. HOPE (Sheffield, Brightside): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the orders for the balance of the amount required for the ships of last year's programme have yet been given out.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) The reply to the hon. Member's Question is in the negative; but the invitations to tender will be issued this week, and it is expected that all the orders will be placed by the end of this month.

Pension of William Welsford, Devonport Shipwright.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is able to state the reason why William Welsford, shipwright, His Majesty's Dockyard, Devonport, has not been assigned his pension under the Workmen's Compensation Act, seeing that he is permanently and totally disabled, and that his injury was sustained more than a year ago.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) On the 13th January last, Welsford was granted a pension of £38 14s. 3d. for life in respect of his service, and on 13th February an allowance of £27 12s. 1d. (10s. 7d. a week) for one year as compensation for injury. These allowances are not, as a rule, granted permanently in the first instance, but are reviewed after a sufficient interval has elapsed to allow of the real effects of the injury being ascertained. The compensation allowance in this case dates from November, 1903, Welsford having received hurt pay up to that date. He has been informed that his case will be further considered at the expiration of the present award when, if his disablement is found to be permanent and total, he will receive compensation accordingly.

Chairman of an Urban District Council--Powers of Voting.

MR. PARROTT (Yorkshire, W.R., Normanton): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether that Board has had occasion to consider whether or no the chairman of an urban district council, elected from outside the council, has an original as well as a casting vote; and what conclusion the Local Government Board has come to thereon.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) The Question has been considered on several occasions, and the view taken by the Department has been that in the circumstances mentioned the chairman of an urban district council has an original as well as a casting vote.

Purchase of Estates in Sligo by the Congested Districts Board.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will give the names of the two estates recently purchased by the Congested Districts Board in Sligo for resale to tenants; also the acreage of tenanted and untenanted land; the amount of purchase money gross rental; and number of years purchase paid the landlord in each case.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The information is given in the following table:—

Name of Estate.	Acreage of land.		Purchase money.	Rental of tenanted land.	Poor Law Valuation of entire estate.	Number of years purchase of the valuation.
	Tenanted.	Untenanted.				
			£	£ *s.* *d.*	£ *s.* *d.*	
Miss Marginson.	506	405	4,412	171 13 6	333 17 0	13¼
Capt. Armstrong.	3,524	326	44,000	1,899 11 2	1,783 11 0	24¾

Cost of Collection of Taxes in Ireland.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the whole of the expenditure of £246,000, shown in the Treasury Return issued the 4th of July, 1903 as the cost of the collection of taxes in Ireland, is incurred in that country, and how the total is made up, setting out the details of £66,000 for Customs and the £180,000 for Inland Revenue separately.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*)

Customs.

The sum of £66,000 is made up as follows:—

(a) £47,000 for effective Services, representing the actual cost of the Customs Staff in Ireland;

(b) £5,000 for general superintending Staff and Law Charges (Salaries);

(c) £14,000 for general non-effective Services (Superannuations).

The two sums (b) and (c) were not actually incurred in Ireland, but they represent the Irish share of these general charges which are divided, for the purposes of the Annual Return, between England, Scotland, and Ireland in the ratio of the amounts of revenue collected in each country.

Inland Revenue.

The approximate net cost of the collection of Inland Revenue Taxes in Ireland for the year 1902–3 was as follows:—

	£
Salaries, Wages, etc. - - - -	125,000
Poundage to Collectors of Income-tax and Copies of Poor Rates	15,600
Salaries, etc. to Distributors of Stamps - - - - - - - -	2,500
Non-effective Charges (Pensions, etc.) - - - - - - - - -	26,000
Other Charges (Travelling, Postage, Carriage, Law Expenses, Rewards, etc.) - - - - -	12,700
	181,800
Deduct:	
Appropriations in Aid (Law Costs and Penalties recovered, etc.) -	1,300
	180,500

The whole of this expenditure was incurred in Ireland.

Issue of South African Clasps to Yeomanry.

SIR. CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): To ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office how it comes that correspondence is still going on with regard to the issue of South African clasps in cases where it is admitted that Yeomanry privates are entitled to them, but that the date of issue is not yet fixed; and whether steps will be taken to put an end to the delay.

(*Answered by Mr. Bromley Davenport.*) Correspondence is still going on as owing to the mass of rolls to be checked it has not yet been found possible to complete all issues. The delay has been due to the supplementary rolls required for the extra clasps granted in October, 1902; 122 extra clasp Yeomanry rolls have been dealt with and the remainder will, it is hoped, be soon cleared off. It must be pointed out that 1,458,440 clasps in all have been issued up to date.

Religious Instruction in Non-Provided Schools.

MR. H. C. RICHARDS (Finsbury E.): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education upon what date and in what manner he proposes to communicate to the House and to the managers of non-provided schools the instructions which have been given to His Majesty's inspectors, not to sanction time-tables in Church of England schools where provision is made for the attendance of children with their parents' consent at such services; and if the Board of Education intend to treat the time-tables of the Roman Catholic schools in the same manner.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) The Board have decided that, as the instructions to be given to their inspectors in the matter referred to in the Question relate to an interpretation of the Education Acts on a particular point, which is of some general interest, they will make the said instructions public. It is hoped that they will be issued very shortly. The action of the Board turns upon the interpretation of the Education Acts, and I am not aware that these afford preferential treatment to one kind of voluntary schools over another.

Fees for Medical Men called in by the Police.

DR. AMBROSE (Mayo, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to complaints made by medical practitioners within the Metropolitan area of the inadequacy of the fees paid by the police for medical services, and the difficulty and expense incurred before obtaining those fees; and, if so, whether, in view of the time involved in these police calls, which are generally cases of injury or poisoning, he can arrange that the fees shall be increased and shall be paid on demand at the local police station from which a medical man is called.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) This matter has not yet come before me, but I understand that the Commissioner of Police has received representations with regard to the amount of certain fees paid by the police for medical services, and that these representations are now receiving his consideration.

Bunker Capacity of "Scout" Class of Boat—Maintenance of Speed.

SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he can state what is the average bunker capacity of the "Scout" class; and whether it is contemplated that these vessels will be able to maintain a sea-speed of 25 knots when loaded to that capacity.

SIR JOHN COLOMB: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the coal capacity at load draught of the "Scout" class is correctly stated in the Navy Estimates this year, pp. 225 and 227, at 150 tons; and, if so, whether these vessels will be required to attain a speed of 25 knots at the contractor's trials when loaded with sufficient coal for 3,000 miles at 10 knots.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) The average bunker capacity of the "Scout" class is 485 tons. The sea speed expected from these vessels when loaded to their full capacity, carrying 485 tons, is not 25 knots, but 24·6 knots, and this speed will increase as the coal is expended. I regret that there was an inaccuracy in my statement to the House of Commons on this subject on Thursday last, as I find that only half and not the full amount of coal required for steaming 3,000 miles at 10 knots is required to be carried on full speed contractors' trials, and this amount does not differ materially from the 150 tons mentioned in the Estimates, and quoted in the recent article in *The Times*.

Customs Duty on Tobacco Strips.

MR. CHARLES MCARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will furnish an estimate of the amount of Customs duty which will, according to the proposed differential duties on tobacco, be payable per pound on imported strips and on strips produced from imported leaf by stripping in this country, respectively, instancing the case of Bright Virginia, and giving the grounds of his estimate.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) According to the proposed differential duties on tobacco it is estimated that the Customs duty paid on a pound of imported strips of Bright Virginia tobacco will be 3s. 3d., and on a pound of strips produced from imported Bright Virginia leaf by stripping in this country will be approximately 3s. 4d. The appended calculation, together with explanatory notes, shows the grounds on which the estimate is based.

Bright Virginia Strips produced in this Country.

lbs.		£	s.	d.	lbs.		£	s.	d.
100	entire leaf containing 15·85% (a) of moisture @ 3s. per lb. - - - - =	15	0	0	19·43	Stalks (a) containing 16·95% moisture became at the rebate standard of 14% moisture—			
	Interest 5% for 2 weeks (b)	0	0	7		lbs.			
	Interest 5% for 3 weeks	0	0	2		18·76 standard lbs. @ 3s. 1d. per lb. =	2	17	10
	Contingencies and revenue restrictions @ ½d. per lb. (c) - - - - -	0	4	2		·67 loss of rebate by excessive moisture on these stalks			
					Total	19·43 stalks			
						73·97 strips produced (d)			
						4·04 sand loss (e)			
						2·56 moisture loss (f)			
						Balance	12	7	1
100 lbs.	Total	£15	4	11	Total	100·00 Total	£15	4	11

$$\frac{£12\ 7s.\ 1d.}{73·97} = 3s.\ 4d.\ \text{per lb.}$$

Explanatory Notes.

In the above table no allowance has been made for loss of material involved in the operation of stripping.

(a) These figures represent averages of four samples of Bright Virginia whole leaf as analysed at the Government Laboratory.

(b) Two weeks allowed as a fair average for stripping 100 lbs. of this class of tobacco. The interest is calculated on the £15 of duty paid by importer. Three weeks allowed for depositing analysing stalks, and waiting to receive the rebate thereon. The interest is calculated on the £2 17s. 10d. rebate paid.

(c) Having regard to the increased quantity of leaf tobacco to be stored, the attendant heavier charges for storage and handling, the additional insurance, licence duty, waste, etc., the sum of ½d. per lb. is a fair one to allow for contingencies.

(d) Calculated thus—

	Imported strips.
Average moisture . .	13·50%
Average sand . .	2·08%
Total .	15·58
Absolutely dry and sandless	84·42
Total .	100·00

Virginian leaf consists of—

lbs.		
19·43	of stalks containing moisture	16·95%
80·57	of strips containing moisture=12·55 lbs. moisture	15·58%
Total 100·00		15·85%

Average sand found by analysis in Virginian leaf 6·12%.

Average sand found by analysis in Virginian stalk=2·87%.

As the sand naturally adhering to the stalk will receive the rebate of 3s. 1d. per lb., this sand should be deducted thus:—

	lbs.
Sand on 100 lbs. leaf . . =	6·12
Deduct sand in 19·43 lbs. of stalk . . =	·55
	5·57 = sand left in 80·57 lbs. of strips produced in this country or lost on stripping.
Total sand and moisture on 80·57 lbs. of strips . . =	18·12
Dry sandless tobacco . . =	62·45
Total .	80·57

But it has been shown above that 84·42 lbs. of dry sandless tobacco represents 100 lbs. of imported strips.

Therefore 62·45 lbs. of dry sandless tobacco represents 73·97 lbs. of strips.

(e) These 73·97 lbs. of strips contain 2·08% sand the same as imported strips, therefore 2·08% of 73·97 lbs. = 1·53 lbs. This deducted from 5·57 lbs.—the total quantity of sand present in 80·57 lbs.—leaves 4·04 lbs.

	lbs.
(f) Total moisture in 80·57 strips produced in this country . . . =	12·55
Average moisture imported strips=13·50% and 13·50% of 73·97 of net strips produced . =	9·99
Difference .	2·56.

Income of Teacher of Ballynaclosha National School.

Mr. P. A. McHUGH (Leitrim, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in accordance with the recognised principle of special consideration in special circumstances, he will request the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland to revise the figures on which the present income of the principal teacher of Ballynaclosha National School was fixed; is he aware that in fixing this teachers' income no allowance was made by the Commissioners for the fact that owing to the prevalence of disease in his district in 1898 and 1899 his income fell considerably below the figure at which it stood before these years; and will he see that this teacher is not penalised through a misfortune which he had no power to avert.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) I answered a similar Question yesterday by the hon. Member for West Kerry.†

Contribution by Irish National Teachers to Upkeep of Schools.

Mr. P. A. McHUGH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can grant a Return showing the amount contributed by the National Teachers of Ireland during the five years ended 31st March, 1904, towards the equipment and general upkeep of their schools.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The Commissioners have no materials from which they could furnish this Return.

Burtonport Railway Agreement.

Mr. McFADDEN (Donegal, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the charges made by William H. Boyd, D.L., Ballymacool, Letterkenny, as to unauthorised changes made by the solicitor to the Lough Swilly Railway Company in the draft making agreement between the Board of Works and the railway company for the making of the Burtonport Railway, a direction will be given to the Board of Works to publish the whole of the correspondence between the Board's solicitor and the solicitor of the Lough Swilly Railway Company as to the agreement entered into for making the Burtonport Railway.

---

† See page 449.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) No, Sir.

Ballinascarthy and Timoleague Light Railway.

MR. MCFADDEN : To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the county council of the county of Cork took over the making of the Ballinascarthy and Timoleague Light Railway in the year 1902, and have since the 31st December, 1902, declined to levy a rate to pay the shareholders the dividend on the 5 per cent. county guarantee of the company, and, if so, the reason of the refusal; whether any steps have been taken to prosecute the late secretary of the company for misappropriation of the sum of £500 drawn by him out of the company's funds in the Munster and Leinster Bank; and whether any proceedings were taken by the county council against the bank for the recovery of the said sum of £500.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) By Order of His Excellency the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, dated 7th July, 1896, the Ballinascarthy and Timoleague Railway was vested in a committee of management of the county council. No application has been made by the county council for the Treasury recoupment of two per cent. on the dividend for the half-year ended 30th June, 1903. I am unable to give any further information.

Longford Drainage.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the attention of the Commissioners of Works in Ireland has been called to the failure of the Longford District Drainage Board to drain the tributary from Mullagharowmeen to the Camlin River which, owing to its neglected condition, is flooding the lands of the riparian occupiers; and, if not, will attention now be directed to it.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) No representations to this effect have been recently made to the Commissioners of Public Works. The trustees of the drainage district are responsible for the maintenance of the drainage works in good order. Complaints of neglect should be made in the first instance to the trustees through their secretary. If complaints so made are without effect, a complaint would then properly lie to the Commissioners.

Deportation to Longford of English and Scotch Paupers.

MR. J. P. FARRELL : To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland to state by what authority pauper inmates of English and Scotch unions have recently been deported to Longford Union; and will an inquiry be made as to whether the provisions of the Act passed to prevent such deportation have been complied with.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The attention of the Local Government Board has not been called to any recent case of deportation of English or Scotch paupers to the Longford Union. If any specific instance is brought under the notice of the Board, in which it is alleged that the law has been violated, it will investigate the matter.

Money for Donegal under the Marine Works Act.

MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any arrangement has yet been arrived at between the Irish Government and the Donegal County Council as to the allocation of the money ear-marked for the county of Donegal under the Marine Works Act; and, if so, what works do the Government propose to carry out under the Act, and the sums of money they intend to spend on each.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) Works have been approved at Gortnasate at an expenditure of £5,000, of which £4,480 will be provided under the Marine Works Act, £500 by the Congested Districts Board, and £20 from local sources. On the 27th June the County Council forwarded the necessary resolutions with respect to works proposed at Portnoo, Cladnageragh, and Downing's Bay. These resolutions are at present before the Commissioners of Public Works for report. An expenditure of £3,000 is contemplated at Portnoo out of funds provided by the Marine Works Act, £1,500 at Cladnageragh, and £4,500 at Downing's Bay. The Congested Districts Board will also make a contribution in each case.

Construction of Sea Wall and Boat Slip at Portasantal, County Donegal.

MR. O'DOHERTY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the attention of the Congested Districts Board, and of the Irish Government, has been called to the necessity for the construction of a sea wall and boat slip at Portasantal, Glengad, county Donegal; whether the fishery experts of the Board are of opinion that the proposed work would be of utility to the fishermen of the district, and save them labour and loss in the discharge of fish from their boats and the beaching thereof; and whether a grant will be made for this purpose out of the moneys voted by Parliament under the Marine Works Act.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The attention of the Congested Districts Board has been directed to the requirements of the fishermen at this place. There are no funds available for undertaking the proposed works there under the Act of 1902.

Expenditure from Army Votes on Brennan Torpedo Establishments.

SIR JOHN COLOMB: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state what, if any, portion of the £32,000 expenditure out of Army Votes for 1903–4 upon Brennan torpedo establishments is for interest upon the capital expenditure upon them of £483,000.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) No portion of this sum of £32,000 was for interest on the capital expenditure of £483,000.

Terms of Retirement of Paymasters of Army Pay Department.

MR. MOON (St. Pancras, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the changes now taking place in the Army Finance Department, he proposes to offer special terms of retirement, as has been done under similar circumstances in the past, to chief paymasters and staff paymasters of the Army Pay Department, who might elect to retire in preference to serving under new conditions.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The scheme for the formation of the Army Accounts Branch is at present under consideration, and I regret that I am, therefore, unable to make any announcement on the subject of the retirement of officials at the present time.

Sale of Government Stores by Colonel Morgan in South Africa.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he has yet received any answer to his inquiry as to the sale of Government stores in South Africa by Colonel Morgan, of the Army Service Corps.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) A report on this subject has just been received from the General Officer Commanding in South Africa, but, in view of the fact that Colonel Morgan has instituted proceedings against the London newspaper which commented on the remarks made by the Chief Justice of the Transvaal in connection with this matter, no action will be taken by the War Office until the case is decided in Court.

Cost of Report of Army Medical Department—Delay in Publication.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: To ask the Secretary of State for War what is the cost of preparing the Annual Report of the Army Medical Department; at what date the Report is generally presented; what is the cause of the delay in its presentation to Parliament; and whether it would be possible to expedite it in future.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The cost of the printing and paper of the Army Medical Department Report falls upon the Stationery Office Votes. It naturally depends on the size of the Report, but I have ascertained that the cost of the Report recently published may be taken as about £180. The Report is generally presented eighteen months after the year to which the Returns refer. It was explained to the hon. Member last year, in reply to a Question, that many of the Returns do not reach this country till the late autumn, owing to the labour of compilation, and that a considerable period is required for the elaboration of the Report from these Returns. I am afraid, therefore, that it is not practicable to expedite its publication.

Resolutions of Inter-Colonial Council as to Railway Administration in South Africa.

MR. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies what were the resolutions finally arrived at by the Inter-Colonial Council for the improvement of railway administration and securing a stricter financial control; whether they have been accepted by Lord Milner and the Government; and whether in consequence it will be necessary to alter the Orders in Council.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) I have not yet received from Lord Milner the final proceedings of the Inter-Colonial Council on this subject. Lord Milner has informed me by telegraph that he will submit to me shortly his proposals arising out of those proceedings.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Flogging in the Navy.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, in accordance with the King's Regulations, official patterns of canes and birches are kept in the home dockyards for comparison in the purchase at these dockyards of canes and birches supplied to the ships of the Royal Navy and naval training ships for the flogging of boys and youths under eighteen, in these ships; whether specimens of the canes and birches thus approved will be produced by the Admiralty for the inspection of Members of the House of Commons.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): The reply to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative, and to the second part in the negative.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Can we not see these tools, as approved by the Admiralty.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member is not entitled to ask whether they will be produced.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Will the hon. Gentleman place a sample of the canes in the tea room.

[No answer was returned.]

Caning Statistics in the Navy.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty on how many boys in the years 1901, 1902 and 1903, were canings inflicted on ships of the Royal Navy and naval training ships; if there is any return of the number of canings inflicted and the offences for which this punishment was awarded.

MR. PRETYMAN: There is no such Return as that mentioned in the latter part of the hon. Member's Question. The only information available is that contained in the daily record of punishments for each ship in the Navy.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Cannot we have a summary of the daily records?

MR. PRETYMAN: It would be a tedious and expensive task to get one out, and I do not think it worth while.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: The canings are dangerous to the boys.

Chatham Military Railway.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether he is aware that a military railway to connect Fort Durland, near Chatham, with Chatham Barracks, planned to run through War Department land for the greater part of its length, had been constructed till it reached, in the immediate vicinity of Fort Durland, a strip of land belonging to the Naval authorities, who had not been consulted in the construction of the railway, and that the refusal of the consent of these authorities to the building of the line on their land has led to the suspension of the work; that near the Chatham end of the railway portions of a bridge were erected at a great cost, with massive piers, to take the line over the main road, when it was discovered that a company had rights to run an electric tramway on the overhead system along this road, so that it was impossible to raise the bridge sufficiently high to clear the wires without altering the level of the railway for hundreds of yards, the result being that the portions of the bridge already erected have been destroyed, and the work on that side brought to a standstill; and will he state what is the sum which it is calculated has been lost by these mistakes, and under what Vote in the Estimates will it come; and whether the War Office has any, and, if so, what explanation of this waste of public money.

*THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Mr. BROMLEY DAVENPORT, Cheshire, Macclesfield): I am informed that the work in question was not suspended on account of any non-agreement with the Naval authorities, but for reasons which were stated in reply to a Question on the 11th June, 1903.† The construction of the line, which was partly undertaken for the purpose of the instruction of the Railway Companies and other Royal Engineer units, was suspended on the introduction of an improved scheme of decentralised training, which rendered the line unnecessary. There was no difficulty connected with an electric tramway running under the line. The whole cost of the work done was comparatively small, as military labour of men under instruction was utilised, and the materials will to a very great extent be made use of elsewhere. The sum may be stated approximately at £2,000, and was included in the amount voted under Vote X. on page 70 of the Estimates for the years 1901–2, 1902–3, 1903–4, under the item "Chatham. Acquisition of land and erection of torpedo factory, etc."

Bitterne Remount Depot.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether any land has been bought by the Government at Bitterne, near Southampton, for the purpose of a remount depôt; if so, what was the area bought and the price paid.

MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: No land has yet been bought at Bitterne, but negotiations for purchase are in progress.

Transvaal Explosives Tax.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if the saving on explosives in the Transvaal in 1903, as compared with 1899, was 1s. 3½d. per ton milled; and if the saving on the total tons milled was £408,533 during the year in which the receipts from the gold mine profit tax were £162,573.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. LYTTELTON, Warwick and Leamington): I am aware that the saving has been estimated at 1s. 3½d. as stated by competent mining authorities. For the explanation of the amount received under the 10 per cent. profit tax, which represents something over 1s. per ton, I must refer the hon. Member to Lord Milner's despatch of 18th June last in the Parliamentary Paper Cd. 2102 just published.

MR. WHITLEY: Are the figures in my Question correct?

MR. LYTTELTON: Yes, as far as I can gather from the authorities I have been able to consult.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): Can the right hon. Gentleman say what the saving would have been, both to the mining industry and the Transvaal, if a new dynamite monopoly had not been granted to the De Beers Company of South Africa?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! That does not arise out of the Answer.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxiii., 635.

Transvaal Legislative Council.

Mr. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies what alterations in the constitution of the Legislative Council of the Transvaal the Government propose to make when the term of office of the present council expires; and whether a representative system will be introduced.

Mr. LYTTELTON: As I stated yesterday, in answer to a Question by the hon. Member for South Molton†, I am not prepared to make any statement on the subject at present.

Mr. BUCHANAN: Have any communications passed with the Transvaal Government.

Mr. LYTTELTON: I cannot go beyond the Answers I have already given.

Mr. LAMBERT: Will the right hon. Gentleman be in a position to make any statement before the session is over?

Mr. LYTTELTON: I cannot say.

Transvaal Finance.

Mr. BUCHANAN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, before the debate on Transvaal finance is taken, he will lay before the House a Report of the proceedings of the Inter-Colonial Council in June; and whether he will also obtain from Lord Milner the final figures of actual revenue and expenditure for the year ending 30th June.

Mr. LYTTELTON: There has not yet been time to receive from Lord Milner a full Report of the proceedings, but I am including in the Papers which will be published this week the text of his opening address as President. I will ask Lord Milner to supply me with the final figures as soon as he is in a position to do so.

Mr. BUCHANAN: The right hon. Gentleman has not answered the second part of my Question: may I further ask if he will be able to tell us before the Vote comes on what modifications have been accepted by the Home Government in regard to the constitution, etc.

Mr. LYTTELTON: I must ask for notice of that.

British Consular Representation in Turkey.

Mr. STEVENSON (Suffolk, Eye): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether His Majesty's Government will enter into friendly conference with the Governments of France and Italy with a view to the early augmentation of the Consular staff in the European and Asiatic provinces of Turkey, by the appointment of travelling Consular Attachés and assistants to the existing Consulates in those vilayets.

The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.): The Consular staff which His Majesty's Government maintain in the European and Asiatic provinces of Turkey is, in their opinion, sufficient for the protection of British interests, and as at present advised they see no reason for increasing it.

Administration of the East Africa Protectorate—Dismissal of Mr. Hopton.

Mr. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he can state on what grounds Mr. Hopton was dismissed by telegraph from the service of the East Africa Protectorate, and why his repeated demands for reasons for his dismissal have not been acceded to; who the gentleman is who has been appointed to his place; and whether he has any practical knowledge of agriculture and knowledge of native language and customs that qualify him for the post.

Earl PERCY: Mr. Hopton was relieved of his duties in the East Africa Protectorate at the request of Sir C. Eliot on the grounds of his unsuitability for the appointment. He was informed of the reasons on three occasions by His Majesty's Commisioner. Mr. J. K. Hill has been appointed to succeed Mr. Hopton. He has practical knowledge of farming and agriculture in Great Britain and South Africa, and was recommended for the post by Sir C. Eliot.

---

† See page 465.

East Africa and Uganda Finances.

MR. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if copies of the Estimates for the service of the East Africa and Uganda Protectorate are to be obtained by Members of Parliament.

EARL PERCY: The Estimates for the Protectorates are given under Class V., Vote II.

Spirit Distillation in England.

MR. WILLIAM McKILLOP (Sligo, N.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will state the total quantity of spirit distilled in England during the year 1903, and how much was used for methylation, rectifying, and compounding purposes; whether any English spirit is used as whisky in Customs warehouses in Leith; and, if so, what is the total quantity despatched thereto from distilleries in England; whether he has any official information showing the materials from which English spirit is usually distilled; and if any beet molasses from abroad is used in its manufacture.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): The total quantity of spirits distilled in England during the year ended 31st March, 1904, was 11,694,851 proof gallons. The quantity of home-made spirits used for methylation during the same period was 4,398,002 proof gallons. I have no means of knowing the quantities used for rectifying and compounding. 33,300 proof gallons of British spirits were despatched to Customs warehouses at Leith from English distilleries during the twelve months ended the 30th of June, 1904. The materials commonly used in the distillation of English spirits are malt, unmalted grain, molasses, sugar, glucose and rice. No doubt beet molasses is used to some extent, but I have no means of knowing the quantities.

Tobacco and the Budget.

MR. LAMBERT: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if, having regard to the inconvenience to the commercial interests of the country, he can state whether he intends to continue or modify his Budget proposals for the taxation of tobacco.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I propose to proceed with the Finance Bill as early as possible. I must defer any further statement as to the tobacco duties until the discussion is resumed.

MR. LAMBERT: Cannot the right hon. Gentleman give a more precise indication of the date than is conveyed in the expression "as early as possible." Does he mean next week?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I must refer the hon. Member to the Answer given by the Prime Minister.

MR. LAMBERT: What was it?

MR. McCRAE (Edinburgh, E.): Will the right hon. Gentleman follow the example of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol when dealing with the cheque tax, and make a statement before the discussion is resumed?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I have just answered that Question.

Telephonic Communication between Country Villages and Market Towns.

CAPTAIN BAGOT (Westmoreland, Kendal): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether, in view of the fact that if post office telephone call offices were established in country village post offices, callers would not be able to communicate with subscribers to the National Telephone Company in the nearest or any adjacent town, in which the exchange was under the National Telephone Company, he will state if this hindrance to an extension of the telephone system between rural districts and country towns is owing to statute law or some agreement between the Postmaster-General and the Telephone Company; and, if so, will he take steps to remedy this state of affairs with a view to placing country villages in telephonic communication with their market and other towns.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): The absence of the right of intercommunication between call offices and exchanges of the the post office in any provincial exchange area and the system of the National Telephone Company in the same area, is not due to any statutory provision or to any agreement between the Postmaster-General and the Company. It arises from the fact that the Postmaster-General has no power to require the Company to give such intercommunication, glad as I should be if such an arrangement could be brought about.

Ankylostomiasis.

MR. JOHNSON (Gateshead): On behalf of the hon. Member for Mid-Durham, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he has taken or will take steps to ensure that in the event of miner's disease (known as ankylostomiasis) arising in any coal or metalliferous mine, a notification thereof should be forthwith sent to the medical officer of health and the mines' inspector of the district in which such mine is situate, and that the isolation of cases that may arise should be secured; and whether, if the administrative powers of the Home Office be not adequate for the purpose, he will introduce the necessary legislation.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. COCHRANE, Ayrshire, N.): I have not yet learnt the results of the conferences between owners and men which were to be arranged in each district to discuss this subject generally, and until I do so any statement as to the precise steps to be taken for the prevention of the disease would be premature, but I doubt whether, from the nature of the case, it is practicable to require notification and isolation of every case of the disease. I am glad to say that no case has yet been found in a coal mine.

Prosecutions for Palmistry, etc., Frauds.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL (Armagh, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the frauds perpetrated in connection with the practice of palmistry, crystal-gazing, clairvoyance, and other species of fortune telling in the West End; and, if so, whether he will instruct the police to institute prosecutions without further delay.

MR. COCHRANE: I have very little to add to the Answer given by my predecessor to a similar Question put by the hon. Member some three years ago.† It was stated then that the police had instructions to watch suspicious cases of the nature indicated by the hon. Member and to take proceedings when there was good ground for believing that fraud or imposition was being practised. Those instructions stand; and a prosecution has been instituted whenever satisfactory evidence of fraud or imposition was available.

MR. FLAVIN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the residents of Park Lane take a very deep interest in this question?

[No Answer was returned.]

Calf Lymph—Disposal of the Calves.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the Government hire live calves for the purpose of vaccinating for lymph; whether he can state at what cost and how long those calves are kept; what becomes of them after being returned to the owner; whether this class of meat is sold as veal for public consumption; whether he has any reports on its fitness for human food by local medical officers of health; and whether it is identified when being sold as "lymph veal."

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): Calves are hired at a cost of from 20s. to 25s. a week for the purpose mentioned. The number of calves used varies. At present the average number is approximately fifteen weekly. The calves are kept for about two weeks. After the lymph has been collected from them, they are slaughtered, and their carcases are thoroughly examined by a veterinary expert. Sound carcases are delivered to the contractor by whom the animals are supplied, to be disposed of as he thinks fit. The concern of the Department in the matter then ceases. I am not aware that any medical officer of health has made a report on the subject, but I am advised that, when the carcases are found to be sound, there is no reason why they should not be sold for food. I have no information as to the practice with regard to the sale of the carcases as meat. The number of the carcases delivered to the contractor in 1903–4 was about 1,000. This is above the average.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, lxxxix., 683.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can state how many calves are kept by the Local Government Board as reservoirs of lymph for vaccination purposes; how many animals so used are sold annually as food for the people; and where the sales usually take place.

MR. WALTER LONG: I may refer the hon. Member to my reply to his other Question in the Paper to-day on this subject.

Traffic Regulations in the Parks.

MR. SCOTT-MONTAGU (Hampshire, New Forest): I beg to ask the hon. Member for Chorley, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, whether, if steps are taken to enforce the ten-mile limit for motor-cars in the Mall and elsewhere in the Parks, the police will equally be instructed to prosecute all drivers of horse-drawn vehicles exceeding that speed.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): The reply is in the negative, as the First Commissioner has already the power, under the Parks Regulation Act of 1872, to limit the speed of carriages to ten miles an hour or to any such speed as may be considered necessary to protect the public from annoyance. The First Commissioner has always taken steps to secure that traffic shall be regulated so as to preserve the enjoyment of the Parks for all classes of the public.

MR. SCOTT-MONTAGU: Does the noble Lord not think it desirable to treat all classes of traffic on the same basis ?

LORD BALCARRES: That is precisely what we propose to do.

Board of Agriculture Leaflets.

MR. A. K. LOYD (Berkshire, Abingdon): I beg to ask the hon. Member for North Huntingdonshire, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the demand for Nos. 7, 17, 37, 59, and 71 of the leaflets issued by the Board has caused these leaflets to be out of print; and whether the Board will consider the desirability of having them reprinted.

MR. AILWYN FELLOWES (Huntingdonshire, Ramsey): The leaflets to which my hon. friend refers are out of print and we do not propose, at any rate for the present, to re-issue them separately, the time when they were of general interest having passed. They will, however, be included in the volume of leaflets about to be published in book form. All leaflets of present or permanent interest are reprinted so soon as there is any sign of an edition being exhausted.

Strokestown Drainage District.

MR. JAMES O'KELLY (Roscommon, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Strokestown Rural District Council recently passed a resolution calling the attention of the Board of Works to the state of the rivers in the Strokestown Drainage District, and complaining that this neglect was the cause of floods and injury to the local farmers in recent years; and, if so, will he say whether it is the intention of the Board of Works to take the necessary steps in the matter.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The resolution was received. The trustees of the drainage district are responsible for the maintenance of the drainage works in good order. The Board of Works informed the district council that complaints of neglect should be made in the first instance to the trustees through their secretary. If complaints so made are without effect a complaint would then properly lie to the Board of Works.

Irish School Teachers' Remuneration—Kilrusheighter Teacher's Claim.

MR. P. A. MCHUGH (Leitrim, N): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the principal teacher of Kilrusheighter (county Sligo) National School taught agriculture for the period commencing in October, 1899, and ending in July, 1900, and was paid £12 17s. 6d. in February, 1901, on account of such tuition in that period, and that the Commissioners of National Education in calculating the consolidated income of this teacher refused to take into account the portion of that sum (£7 14s. 6d.) which was earned by him for the period from 1st October, 1899, to 31st March, 1900, and assigned as the ground of their refusal the fact that the payment for his tuition in agriculture for the period from October, 1899, to July, 1900, was not made until February, 1901; and, if so, whether, seeing that under Rule 200 the Commissioners were bound to include all emoluments actually earned from State sources within the three years ended 31st March, 1900, the application of the manager, Very Rev. John Melvin, P.P., for a revision of this teacher's salary will be granted.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The claims of this teacher have formed the subject of a correspondence between myself and the Rev. Mr. Melvin, a copy of which I recently communicated to the hon. Member. As already pointed out, the Commissioners had no power to take into account, when fixing the consolidated income of the teacher, a payment made subsequently to the 31st March, 1900. But even if payment had been made before that date, it was never contemplated by the rules that grants covering, as in this case, services rendered for a period of only six months should be continued in perpetuity under the form of consolidated income.

Mr. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): Does not the Rule specifically state that all moneys actually earned by the teacher for the three years should be brought into the calculation?

Mr. P. A. McHUGH: And is it not the fact that this £7 14s. 6d. was earned in the period ending the 31st March, 1900?

Mr. WYNDHAM was understood to reply that it was never contemplated to include money earned for a purely temporary duty.

Technical Instruction Act—Return of Officials.

Mr. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will grant a Return dealing with officials employed by the various county boroughs in Ireland in carrying out the provisions of the Technical Instruction Act.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I am prepared to give a Return in the form proposed, with the exception of the information indicated in Columns 3 and 8. For the reasons already explained, I cannot consent to this information.

Appended is the Return asked for.

Technical Instruction (Ireland) (Officials). Return of Officials employed upon the 1st day of June, 1904, by the various County Boroughs and Urban Councils in Ireland in carrying out the provisions of the Technical Instruction (Ireland) Act, in the following form:—

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Name.	Description of office.	Qualification, giving University degrees, the College attended, and time spent.	Salary.	Date of appointment.	Previous employment.	Tenure of office.	Nationality.

Munster Dairy School.

Mr. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Department of Agriculture now propose to utilise the £10,000 set aside for the enlargement and improvement of the Munster Dairy School; and what is the reason for the delay in carrying out these improvements for which money was granted under the Act of 1889.

MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member does not appear to have seen my reply to the similar Question of 4th May by the hon. Member for North Cork.† I have no further statement to make at present.

Irish Intermediate Education—System of Inspection.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the Report of the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland for 1903, dealing with the subject of the establishment of a system of permanent inspection of the working of intermediate education; whether he is aware that the Board, in June, 1903, forwarded a resolution to the Under-Secretary to the effect that they desired to impress on the Lord-Lieutenant the great urgency of appointing permanent inspectors as a necessary part of the reforms aimed at by the Act of 1900; and, if so, what is the cause of delay in the adoption of a system of inspection declared to be urgent by the Board responsible for the working of secondary education in Ireland.

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes, Sir. The Government has not refused to provide for a system of inspection. It has only refused to establish, at the present moment, a system of inspection conducted by a staff of permanent Civil servants; and both on financial and educational grounds it adheres to that position until the question of the parts which examination and inspection are respectively to play in the distribution of State aid to the schools has been settled. This is one of the matters now under investigation by the Committee of Inquiry into Intermediate Education in Ireland.

MR. FLYNN: Is the right hon. Gentleman not aware that the Commissioners of Intermediate Education fifteen years ago reported against the present system and a supplementary system was set up.

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes; but I have said the whole matter is now under investigation.

Blakeney Estate, County Galway.

MR. ROCHE (Galway, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state if the Blakeney Estate, Abbert, county Galway, is in the Land Judge's Court; if so, for how long; whether he can state the name of the agent or receiver; whether he has been instructed to take advantage of the Land Purchase Act; and whether he will be directed to supply to the tenants any necessary information to enable them to make an offer for the property.

MR. WYNDHAM: The estate is in the Land Judge's Court. A petition for sale was filed by the late owner in 1883, but little has been done to effect a sale. There is no receiver over the lands, and the estate is solvent. The provisions of Section 40 of the Act of 1896 are not, therefore, applicable in the case. The Land Judge cannot compel a sale, but it is understood that when the matter comes again before him in November, the parties having carriage of the estate must either elect to sell or have the proceedings dismissed from the Court.

Irish Development Grant Bill — Petty Sessions Clerks Fund.

MR. O'SHEE (Waterford, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the County Waterford County Council has passed a resolution urging that he should withdraw the clause in the Irish Development Grant Bill, which proposes to transfer to the Treasury the sum of £150,000 standing to the credit of the Petty Sessions Clerks Fund; and whether he will re-consider the matter, and adopt the course suggested.

MR. WYNDHAM: No, Sir; the resolution does not appear to have been brought under my notice. In reply to the second part of the Question I would refer to my reply to the similar Question of 20th June by the hon. Member for South Tyrone.‡

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxiv., 394.

‡ See (4) *Debates*, cxxxvi., 490.

Kerry Rent Appeals.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that tenants in county Kerry who served their landlords with rent-fixing notices six years ago are still waiting to have their appeals heard; whether, under these circumstances, steps will be taken to have those appeals heard during the coming autumn.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Land Commissioners sat in Killarney for the hearing of appeals in July, 1903. The list then for hearing contained all appeals lodged prior to May, 1901. It is however, a fact that in some cases in which appeals were lodged since that date and which are still pending, the originating notices were originally lodged as far back as the period mentioned in the Question. It is not at present possible to say when the Commissioners will hold their next sitting for the disposal of appeals from Kerry.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: Seeing that six years have elapsed since the notices were served can the right hon. Gentleman hold out any hope that a decision will be arrived at in the next ten years?

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes, I think I can promise that.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): May I say that I propose on Thursday next to raise the whole question of the collapse of the Appeal Court.

MR. FLAVIN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the tenants pending the decision of the Court are compelled to pay the whole rent, and is not that a great burden on them?

[No Answer was returned.]

Amalgamation of Offices of Antrim and Belfast Clerks of the Peace.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN (Kilkenny, N): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the nature of the arrangements made by the Lord-Lieutenant with reference to the amalgamation of the offices of the Clerk of the Peace for Belfast, Clerk of the Peace for county Antrim, and Clerk of the Crown for county Antrim; what saving will be effected to the Treasury by the new arrangements; and whether the saving thus effected will be devoted to Irish purposes.

MR. WYNDHAM: These offices are united in the same person under the provisions of Section 8 of the County Court and Officers Act, 1877, and Section 69 of the Local Government Act, 1898. The amount of the salary, and of the allowance for clerical assistance, has not yet been fixed. When fixed it will be paid out of moneys voted by Parliament. As a set-off, to some small extent, to this charge the fees hitherto received by the Clerk of the Peace and Clerk of the Crown will be paid into the Exchequer. In the result a burden not hitherto borne by the Treasury will be transferred to Imperial Funds to the relief of local rates.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): Is it not calculated that a very large saving will be effected by the amalgamation.

MR. WYNDHAM: At any rate it is a bargain resting upon a statutory provision.

Westropp Estate, County Clare.

MR. SHEEHY (Meath, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to a request lodged with the Land Commissioners by the tenants on the Westropp Estate, county Clare, under the seventh Section of the Land Act of 1903; and, if so, whether he will take steps to expedite the sale of this property.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Estates Commissioners have issued a request to the Land Judge for particulars of this estate under Section 7 of the Act of 1903.

Police Constable Molloy, Royal Irish Constabulary.

MR. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state on what date the conduct of Police Constable Molloy, in connection with the Coleraine Petty Sessions, was reported to the Inspector-General; and on what date the censure was conveyed to him.

MR. WYNDHAM: On the 29th June in each case.

Greencastle Police Force.

Mr. JOSEPH DEVLIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the pledges given last year that the removal of Sergeant Gallagher from the charge of Greencastle, county Antrim, police district, and the substitution for him of Head Constable Moore was only a temporary arrangement, he will say whether any circumstance has arisen in the meantime to cause a reconsideration of that promise; and, if so, what is its nature; and, if nothing detrimental to the character of Sergeant Gallagher has taken place since then, he will be reinstated in his old position.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The question of the retention of the head constable at Greencastle is entirely a matter for the consideration of the Constabulary authorities. He was transferred to that station in August last in the interests of the public. The Commissioner of Police at Belfast reports that he has the confidence of all classes and that he is aware of no reasons for transferring him from Greencastle. The Inspector-General concurs in the views of the Commissioner, and I do not propose to intervene in the matter.

Mr. JOSEPH DEVLIN: Is not the retention of Head Constable Moore looked upon as an insult to Sergeant Gallagher?

Mr. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member will see that the employment of an officer at a particular place cannot and does not reflect on any other officer's character. It is a matter of discipline and administrative convenience with which the Inspector-General is competent to deal.

Mr. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): Have the inhabitants of Greencastle made any complaint as to this head constable being there.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I do not think so.

Mr. MACVEAGH: Did not the right hon. Gentleman last session say that the head constable was only stationed there temporarily, and did not the Police Commissioner for the city of Belfast promise a deputation subsequently that the appointment should be permanent?

Mr. WYNDHAM: I cannot say, but at any rate it does not alter my view that this is a matter for the Inspector-General.

Mr. MACVEAGH: Has the Belfast Commissioner superior jurisdiction to the right hon. Gentleman.

[No answer was returned.]

Administration of the Arms Act at Maryborough.

*Mr. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state by whom a gun, the property of Mr. Peter Dowling, Straboe, was given into the possession of the police at Maryborough; and whether the gun has been returned to the owner.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The gun was handed to the police by the owner of the property on which it was found. On the 16th June† I stated I had been informed that the gun had been identified by Mr. Dowling as belonging to him; that he had undertaken to make a declaration to this effect, and that the weapon was taken out of his possession without his knowledge or approval; and that when this declaration had been made it would be restored to him. He has not yet made the declaration, however, and has informed the police he is not now sure that the gun is his.

*Mr. DELANY: Who was the owner of the property.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I confess I cannot fathom the mystery of the gun. I hope it will get back to the right man.

Comyn Kenny Estate, County Galway.

Mr. ROCHE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can now state if the tenant purchasers under Acts previous to 1903, in the neighbourhood of the Comyn Kenny Estate, county Galway, which has been purchased recently by the Congested Districts Board, may have their uneconomic holdings increased without requiring them to resell their purchased holdings to the Congested Districts Board.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxvi., 288.

MR. WYNDHAM: The tenant purchaser is not bound to resell his holding. The outstanding balance of the loan already made must be consolidated with the new advance and a new annuity becomes payable in respect of the enlarged holding, which is thenceforth treated as one holding. Some administrative difficulties exist when the advances are made under different statutes. These are under consideration.

In reply to a further Question by MR. KILBRIDE,

MR. WYNDHAM said that when an addition was made to a holding which had been purchased the two were merged into one holding and the instalments were consolidated; but, where the first holding was purchased under a former Act and the addition under the present Act, there were technical difficulties for which he hoped a solution would be found.

Miltown-Malbay Petty Sessions Clerk.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the fact that Head Constable Allingham was recently elected petty sessions clerk at Miltown-Malbay, he can say what special qualifications beyond being a police officer he had over local civilian candidates which induced the local magistrates to appoint him; was Head Constable Allingham in the police service when elected; and, if not, when did he leave the force for the purposes of his candidature, and was it by leave; whether he is still in the police force; and can he give the date when he is to take up the duties of petty sessions clerk.

MR. WYNDHAM: The head constable was stationed at Miltown-Malbay for twenty years prior to his transfer on promotion to another district in November last. He was consequently well known to the magistrates who elected him to the position of petty sessions clerk, for which he was considered the best qualified. The Inspector-General granted him permission to become a candidate. He will qualify for a pension from the police force on the 14th inst., and he cannot enter on his new duties until after that date. Before his appointment is confirmed he will undergo an examination to test his fitness for the office.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that there is great dissatisfaction in the district as to the way in which this appointment was made, seeing that some of the magistrates were not summoned to the meeting. Has the right hon. Gentleman any power to insist on a new election?

MR. WYNDHAM. I am not aware of the matters referred to, and I doubt if I have any power, but I will inquire.

Land Purchase by Congested Districts Board in County Sligo.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will give the names of the two estates recently purchased by the Congested Districts Board in Sligo for resale to tenants; also the acreage of tenanted and untenanted land; the amount of purchase money; gross rental; and number of years purchase paid the landlord in each case.

MR. WYNDHAM: It will be more convenient to give a written reply to this Question, and with the hon. Member's permission the desired information will be printed with to-day's Votes.

Harlech Estate, County Sligo.

MR. O'DOWD: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the fee simple of the Leitrim Hill grazing farm, situate on the Harlech Estate, in Tobercurry Union, county Sligo, has recently been purchased by a landlord named Phibbs, without the knowledge of the small tenants of the district, who have been using it as an accommodation farm for a number of years; if so, will he say if such sale was sanctioned by the Land Commission; and, if not, will this matter be inquired into with the view of having the farm utilised for the enlargement of small holdings, should the estate be sold to the tenants at any future time.

MR. WYNDHAM: The estate comprising the farm referred to has not been offered to the Estates Commissioners. I am also informed that it has not been offered to the Congested Districts Board.

MR. O'DOWD: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that negotiations are pending between the landlord and tenants on the Harlech Estate?

MR. WYNDHAM: I am not.

River Owenmore Drainage.

MR. O'DOWD: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the fact that the River Owenmore in the county Sligo takes its rise in, and flows through, a scheduled congested district; and that a scheme for the drainage of this river under the Arterial Drainage Acts is, under existing circumstances, impracticable, he will advise the Congested Districts Board or the Board of Agriculture to allocate a certain sum by way of grant in aid to local effort for the carrying out of the work of draining this river.

MR. WYNDHAM: There are no funds at the disposal of the Congested Districts Board or Department of Agriculture out of which to contribute towards the cost of drainage works.

MR. O'DOWD: If the people in the locality take the initiative in the work will they be encouraged with a grant from public funds?

MR. WYNDHAM: I do not think there is any fund available for the purpose.

Congested Districts Board—Examinations for Temporary Clerkships.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will explain why the system of examinations for temporary clerkships in the Congested Districts Board, Ireland, has been abolished; whether, in making future appointments, the Board will have preference for those men whose names were registered on their books to compete at the examinations; whether in the meantime the Board are filling vacancies by selecting men of good character and education, or who have had experience in public or commercial offices; whether a sub-committee has been selected to make these appointments; and, if so, will he state how long it is intended to continue this system.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Board is in correspondence with the Treasury on the subject of the mode of making appointments to its staff. Should it be found necessary to hold examinations for appointment of temporary clerks, pending a settlement of the question, the Board will endeavour to procure the services of the best men available.

Irish National School Teachers' Pay.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Government intend to take measures so that the payment of Irish national teachers shall be increased so as to place them upon an equality with English teachers.

MR. WYNDHAM: In any comparison between the incomes of Irish national school teachers and teachers in England, regard must be had to the burden on the State and on local sources. The incomes paid to teachers in Ireland represent a payment from the State of £2 8s. 11d. for each child in average daily attendance. In England and Wales, the cost of maintenance of the schools is £2 13s. 2d. per pupil, of which only £1 10s. 8d. was derived from the State in the case of Board schools.

Irish Congested Districts Board Staff.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will explain why the Congested Districts Board (Ireland) have asked the Treasury to allow their staff to be recruited from the regular permanent Civil Service men who have entered through the Civil Service Commissioners' Examination; and whether this suggestion will be adopted by the Treasury.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH, Derbyshire, W.): The Congested Districts Board, through the Irish Government, have asked whether the Treasury would be disposed to consider favourably a proposal to appoint a certain number of permanent clerks to their staff. Correspondence on the subject is still proceeding, but no decision has yet been arrived at.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Can the right hon. Gentleman say what is the Irish Government? We do not know.

[No Answer was returned.]

BILLS OF EXCHANGE ACT (1882) AMENDMENT BILL [LORDS].

Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next and to be printed. [Bill 257.]

NEW MEMBER SWORN.

John Sharpe Higham, esquire, for the County of York, Northern part of the West Riding (Sowerby Division).

LICENSING BILL (PROCEDURE).

Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Question [1st July], "That the proceedings in Committee and on Report of the Licensing Bill shall be brought to a conclusion in the manner hereinafter mentioned on six allotted days:

(a) The proceedings in Committee on Clause 1 on the first allotted day;

(b) The proceedings in Committee in Clauses 2 and 3 on the second allotted day;

(c) The proceedings in Committee on Clause 4 on the third allotted day;

(d) The proceedings in Committee on the remaining clauses of the Bill, and on any new Government clauses, and on schedules and any new Government schedules, and any other proceedings necessary to bring the Committee stage to a conclusion on the fourth allotted day;

(e) The proceedings on Report on any new clauses and on Amendments to Clauses 1, 2, and 3 of that Bill, be brought to a conclusion on the fifth allotted day; and

(f) The proceedings on Report be concluded on the sixth allotted day.

After this Order comes into operation, any day shall be considered an allotted day for the purposes of this Order on which the Licensing Bill is put down as the first Order of the Day.

At 11 p.m. on the said allotted days, or if the day is a Friday at 4.30 p.m., the Chairman or Speaker shall put forthwith the Question or Questions on any Amendment or Motion already proposed from the Chair, and shall next proceed successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments moved by the Government of which notice has been given (but no other Amendments) and on every Question necessary to dispose of the allotted business to be concluded on the allotted day.

In the case of Government Amendments, or of Government new clauses or schedules, he shall put only the Question that the Amendment be made, or that the clause or schedule be added to the Bill, as the case may be.

At 12 midnight on the day on which the Third Reading of the Bill is put down as first Order, or, if that day is a Friday, at 5.30 p.m., the Speaker shall put forthwith any Question necessary to conclude the proceedings on that stage of the Bill.

Proceedings to which this Order relates shall not be interrupted (except at an Afternoon Sitting at 7.30 p.m.), under the provisions of any Standing Order relating to Sittings of the House.

After the passing of this Order, on any day on which any proceedings on the Licensing Bill stand as the first Order of the Day, no dilatory Motion on the Bill, nor under Standing Order No. 10, nor Motion to postpone a clause, shall be received unless moved by the Minister in charge of the Bill, and the Question on any such Motion shall be put forthwith. Nor shall any opposed Private Business be set down at the Evening Sitting for consideration on any of the allotted days or on the day on which the Third Reading of the Bill is put down as first Order.

If Progress be reported the Chairman shall put this Order in force in any subsequent sitting of the Committee."—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

Question again proposed.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) moved as an Amendment the omission from line two of the words "in Committee and." This was, he said, really in the nature of a protest against the destruction of the Committee stage of the Bill. He could have quite understood a proposal from the Government to limit the discussion on the Report stage, for they might have pointed out that questions having been fully threshed out in Committee it was rather unfair to go over them again on the Report stage. It would have been much more reasonable to give six days to the Report stage than to confine the Committee stage to that period. The Committee stage was the most important stage, and he did appeal to the Government to confine their guillotine Motion to the Report stage. He supposed it was quite futile for him to make the appeal, but he did not think the Opposition would be doing its duty if it did not protest on every possible opportunity against the virtual destruction of the Committee stage. He had gone through the Amendments thoroughly, and his Parliamentary experience enabled him to gather that the number of substantial ones on the Paper was so large that if they merely divided on each and did not attempt to discuss them, the Resolution did not allow sufficient time to deal with all of them. It was therefore perfectly preposterous to attempt to confine the discussion to six days; it was reducing their work to an absolutely absurd farce.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 2, to leave out the words 'in Committee and.' "—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'in Committee and' stand part of the Question."

*MR. DAVID MACIVER (Liverpool, Kirkdale) said that as one of the supporters of the Licensing Bill, which he believed to be a thoroughly good one, he objected to seeing it wrecked by a side wind. In his opinion the proposal of the Prime Minister would afford amply sufficient time for the honest consideration of the measure. He had no wish to say anything about obstruction, but hon. Members knew very well that in the Committee stage, as one Amendment was disposed of, another technically in order, and raising exactly the same point, was put on the Paper. Therefore he felt that unless the Government Resolution was agreed to in its entirety, there was considerable probability of the Bill being smothered in talk. He could not help feeling that in the interest of fair debate it was better the closure Resolution should be agreed to as it stood.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! order, the hon. Member is now dealing with the whole Question. The Amendment only raises a very small point.

*MR. DAVID MACIVER said, as he understood it, the point was whether or not the Government Resolution should apply to the Committee stage. That was the point he was endeavouring to argue.

MR. SPEAKER: But the hon. Member was expressing his opinion that the whole Motion should be passed.

* MR. DAVID MACIVER said he did think so. Continuing, the hon. Member said the question was whether the Committee stage should be prolonged indefinitely. Now his view was that it would be a great advantage if the speeches were terse and to the point, without being unreasonably prolonged. If that were secured there was a probability that reasonable Amendments would be carefully argued, and that the speeches would be listened to. The tendency was to reiteration, and the Government Resolution would prevent that. There was another point to be considered. Some hon. Members of that House had occupations outside, and it ought not to be made impossible for those who were not merely professional politicians to attend to those occupations. He for one looked on the House of Commons as the great Council of the Nation, and they ought to be able to listen to real debates, to argue real Amendments, and to have them discussed impartially. Too many of the Amendments now brought forward were mere repetition, and that afforded ample justification for closuring the debate on the Committee Stage.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said he viewed with considerable apprehension the application of this Resolution, which practically superseded the Rules recently adopted for the conduct of the business of the House. In his opinion the most useful stage in the progress of a Bill was the Committee stage; it was at that stage that the suggestions were made the adoption of which made a measure practicable and workable. Useful and fruitful work was done in Committee. But he desired to point out what would be one effect of the adoption of the Resolution as it now stood. It provided that the Committee stage on the Licensing Bill should be brought to a conclusion after so many days. Did hon. Members quite apprehend what that meant? What not unfrequently happened in the case of other Bills was not unlikely to happen on this measure. It might become necessary to recommit the Bill, and he doubted whether, supposing the Resolution were carried, Mr. Speaker would put a Motion for recommittal, inasmuch as there would be no Committee to which the Bill could be recommitted, because by the Resolution the Committee stage would have been concluded. His view was that in voting for this Amendment the House would be voting for the curtailment of its powers on the Report stage, and would deprive itself of the useful power of recommittal. In view of the fact that no plea either of urgency or of obstruction had been advanced in support of the Resolution, he deplored that the Government should, so soon after the new Rules had been passed, come before the House with a proposal of this nature.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.) said he would venture to point out that this Amendment really contradicted in substance the conclusion at which the House arrived at midnight last night. There was no speech which was made in favour of the Resolution which could not, with equal propriety of course, be made against this modification. The hon. Gentleman who moved must be perfectly aware, indeed he rather judged from his speech that he was aware, that to carry his Amendment would nullify the whole effect they might anticipate from the passage of the Resolution. It was on the Committee stage that they had the sixty-five pages of Amendments, it was on the Committee stage that they saw before them the actual means by which the proceedings on this Bill might be indefinitely postponed. And he had not the smallest doubt, when they had waded through the sixty-five pages of Amendments, and the additions which the ingenuity of hon. Gentlemen would doubtless prompt before the end of the Committee stage, that all this would have to be gone through again on the Report stage. This Amendment, in truth, was not an Amendment, but the destruction of the Resolution; and he thought everybody who supported the Resolution last night was bound in common consistency to support the Government now in resisting it. This was substantially the question which was discussed yesterday, and under the circumstances he did not doubt that the House could without very prolonged debate come to the same conclusion as that at which it arrived a few hours previously on the main question.

MR. MIDDLEMORE (Birmingham, N.) said the Prime Minister had parenthetically dealt with the question of the extension of the time for the Committee stage.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! That point will arise on a future Amendment.

MAJOR JAMESON (Clare, W.) declared that the House if it accepted this Amendment would nullify all the decisions at which it had arrived by huge majorities on the various stages of the Licensing Bill. The Amendment asked for more time for the consideration of the Bill. But he would like to draw the attention of the House to the time that had been already expended. More time was asked for the discussion of Clause 1, that clause dealt with the question of quarter sessions, and he would like to point out that the First and Second Reading debates were concentrated on the subject of the powers of quarter sessions.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! That question does not now arise. The point now is whether the Committee stage shall be expunged from the Resolution.

MAJOR JAMESON said he of course bowed to the ruling of the Chairman. What he was particularly anxious about was that the decisions arrived at by huge majorities should not now be nullified. The House must not stultify itself, and he hoped that the Government would rigidly adhere to their Resolution.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 220; Noes, 160. (Division List No. 189.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allhusen, AugustusHenryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster,Rt.Hn.Hugh O
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot,Capt.Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour,Rt.Hon. A. J.(Manch'r)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour,Rt.HnGeraldW.(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry,Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brown, Sir Alex.H.(Shropsh.)
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Campbell, Rt.Hn.J.A.(Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Chamberlain,RtHonJ.A.(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig,Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dixon-Hartland,Sir FredDixon
Dorington, Rt.Hn. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt.Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson, Rt.Hn.Sir J.(Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gordon, Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton,Marq of(L'nd'nderry
Hardy,Laurence(KentAshford)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jeffreys, Rt.Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood, (Sussex)
Kennaway, Rt.Hn.Sir John H.
Kenyon,Hon. Geo. T.(Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.(Salop.
Kerr, John
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks., N.R.
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col.CharlesW.(Evesham)
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.)
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Iver,Sir Lewis(Edinburgh,W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W.F.
Maxwell,RtHn.Sir H.E(Wigt'n
Maxwell, W.J.H. (Dumfriessh.)
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell, William (Burnley)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Peel, Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purkis, Robert
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, S.Forde(Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt.Hn.Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robinson, Brooke
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, SirHarryS.(Limehouse
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk

Stanley, Edward Jas.(Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G(Oxf'dUniv.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E(Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G.E.(Notts.)
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wills, Sir Frederick
Wilson, A. Stanley (York,E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H.(Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bowles, T.Gibson (King's Lynn
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Daives, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay(Galway)
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas. Charles M. (Lanark)
Elibank, Master of
Ellice,Capt E.C.(SAndrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Evans, Sir Fran. H. (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Field, William
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hain, Edward
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol,E.)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy,Vincent P.(Cavan,W.
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal,W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,Sir Joseph F.(Accrington)
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh,N.)
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Murphy, John
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Doherty, William
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Reid, Sir R.Threshie (Dumfries
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roche, John
Rose, Cuarles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A.(Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas,J.A.(GlamorganGower
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, JohnCathcart(Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Woodhouse,Sir J.T(Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Lloyd - George and Mr. M'Kenna.

MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.) moved to omit from the Resolution the words "and on Report." He submitted that in view of the number of Amendments to be moved in Committee by the Home Secretary, and of the suggestions which had already been partially accepted by the Government, more than two days would be necessary for the revision of the Bill on the Report stage. Anybody who had been a Member of the House for any length of time would know that the Report stage was very essential in order to revise the patchwork legislation done in Committee. The Committee stage he looked upon as a work in mosaic, Amendments were suggested and forms of words brought forward and accepted hurriedly, and they certainly required prolonged examination on Report, so as to make the Bill a workmanlike piece of legislation.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 2, to leave out the words 'and on Report.'"—(*Mr. Yoxall.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'and on Report' stand part of the Question."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR expressed surprise that it should have been thought necessary to move the Amendment. The main object of the Resolution was to deal with the Committee and Report stages.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): And the Third Reading.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that to accept the Amendment would be to stultify the decision at which the House had already arrived. In support of the contention of the Opposition that there had been no obstruction, it was urged that the debates in Committee had been carried on practically under Report rules; that the same Member had not thought it necessary to exercise his right to speak more than once on the same Amendment. That only showed that the same time might be expended on the Report stage as on the Committee stage, and that the sixty-six pages of Amendments now down for the Committee stage might be transferred bodily and without modification to the Report stage without any Member suffering the least inconvenience from the fact that he could only speak once on each Amendment. In these circumstances he hoped the House would not accept the Amendment, which would not make a merely superficial change in the Government proposal but would absolutely destroy it.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) thought the House would note with surprise the attitude taken up by the right hon. Gentleman. It was not reasonable for him to say that there was no case to be made o t for eliminating the Report stage which might not equally well have been urged in favour of the cutting out of the Committee stage. There could be no doubt that the feeling of the House in regard to the Resolution was far from unanimous, and during the debate some of the most respected Members on the Government side of the House had expressed themselves in favour of some extension of the time to be devoted to the Bill. If they were to have more time, obviously it could best be given in connection with the Report stage, and therefore he should support the Amendment. If the Report stage was entirely eliminated the House would gain the opportunity of compromise. The Report stage was obviously the stage when a measure could be reconsidered and compromise arrived at. As the Resolution now stood there would not be any possibility of that because when it was reached the whole of that stage might be occupied in considering second-rate Amendments. This was one of those cases where it was of the utmost importance that the well-considered opinion of the House should be recorded. As the matter stood who would say that the Report stage would be anything but a farce. He therefore suggested that as some of the supporters of the Government desired more elasticity this was the time that they ought to bring pressure to bear on the Prime Minister. If this Amendment were carried it would leave the House a full opportunity to consider the Bill on Report, and if there were any conciliatory spirit shown on the Treasury Bench he ventured to say the Report stage would not occupy the time which the right hon. Gentleman anticipated; that only a few important Amendments would be taken. If there was to be no conciliation at any cost he could only say it would not redound to the credit of the Government or to the advantage of the Bill, and it was a ridiculous farce to occupy the time in discussing this Resolution if the right hon. Gentleman had made up his mind to shut his ears to every argument in favour of the Amendment. He, however, hoped that it was not yet too late to appeal to the right hon. Gentleman to pay some heed to the unanimity of opinion in favour of this extension of time, and that the right hon. Gentleman would view with some favour this Amendment.

Mr. McKENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) expressed the opinion that in curtailing the limits of debate in this House, the right hon. Gentleman was not entitled to go one step beyond what was necessary. One ground for the Resolution of the right hon. Gentleman was that there were sixty-six pages of Amendments on the Paper for the Committee stage, and it was because the right hon. Gentleman did not see the possibility of getting through those Amendments at an early date that he moved this Resolution. But the right hon. Gentleman could not possibly know what Amendments would come up on Report and he submitted that the right hon. Gentleman ought not to adopt this drastic procedure with regard to Report until he saw how he stood. He asserted that if the Report stage was not curtailed the right hon. Gentleman would find that the Amendments put down would be inconsiderable and only deal with important phases of the Bill, and he contended that the House ought not to consent to the proposal to confine the discussion on Report to two days until they had seen what would happen in Committee. They did not know what the Bill was that would be brought before the House on Report. And if the right hon. Gentleman found he was being badly treated in the matter of Amendments he had two courses open to him, both effective. He could either move a Motion of this kind or move that all words down to a certain point stand part. This was a defence of the rights of the House which all private Members were entitled to claim. They were asked to limit the time for discussion before they knew what the Bill was they were to be asked to discuss and, having regard to the fact that only three lines of the Bill had been dealt with in Committee, he submitted that the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman was entirely without precedent, and that the right hon. Gentleman was going further than he was entitled to go. By consenting to the Amendment the right hon. Gentleman would give the House that opportunity to consider the various clauses of the Bill which they would be denied in Committee, without which the public at large would not accept the Bill in its final form as the considered judgment of the House of Commons.

Mr. SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid.) thought that both the Committee and the Report stage should have been dealt with in this matter, but as the proposal with regard to the Committee had been carried he now submitted that the Amendment put down to keep the Report stage in the hands of the House without limitation was a reasonable Amendment. Only two days were to be allowed on Report, on new clauses as well as on all clauses amended in Committee. A full Report stage ought to be allowed for the new clauses alone, and for that very reason the Report stage ought to be extended. One very remarkable thing was that more than half the new clauses had been put down by supporters of the Government. The hon. Member for Hackney had one; the hon. Member for Wakefield had one, and the hon. Member for Hammersmith, who was a thick-and-thin supporter of the Government, also had one. There was actually one in the name of the hon. Member for North Kensington. What would he say when it was said that the Report stage was to be limited. If the Committee stage was to be swept away it was obviously the more important that the Report stage of the Bill should be carried out in accordance with the ordinary forms and rules of the House. As his hon. friend had pointed out they did not yet know what Amendments would be put down for Report. His hon. friend also suggested two remedies to the right hon. Gentleman for dealing with them; he would suggest another easy remedy. If it was found that there would have to be much discussion the right hon. Gentleman might suspend the operation of the twelve o'clock rule. That was always done at the end of a session in order to expedite business, and if the plan were adopted on the

Report stage of this Bill it would be passed in a short time because although men were willing to stay in the House until two or even three o'clock in order to conduct business they would not wait for the mere purpose of obstruction. Rather than the Report stage should be curtailed he would suggest that the Third Reading stage of a Bill, which had been contested as this had been, was, in his opinion, perfectly useless. They only had stale speeches which were of no value, and he thought an hour should be quite sufficient to dispose of the Third Reading. They would then have a brilliant oration from the Home Secretary replied to by an eloquent twenty-minutes speech from the other side and then the division might be taken. In his own interests the Prime Minister would do well to make some concession. Putting aside mere newspaper opinion, there was the opinion of the solid and respectable members of the community to the effect that the Prime Minister had been forced to bring forward this closure Resolution at the behest of the brewers.

Mr. SPEAKER intimated that that question could not be rediscussed upon every Amendment.

Mr. SAMUEL EVANS said he was merely trying to urge a reason why, having got the Committee stage, the Prime Minister should exempt some portion of the proceedings from the Resolution in order to indicate his contention that he was acting in the interests of eternal justice and not of the brewers.

Sir ROBERT REID (Dumfries Burghs), referring to the Prime Minister's complaint that first a Motion was made to exempt the Committee stage and then another to exempt the Report stage, said the reason was that six days were not too much for the Committee and might not be too much for Report, and that so long as the right hon. Gentleman remained inflexible, those who thoroughly disapproved of the proposed limitation would have to attempt to secure the exemption first of one stage and then of another. It would be much more pleasant to leave the Bill, and look forward to another Parliament to deal with the matter, but that was not really the duty of the Opposition. Their duty was to make the best of the existing circumstances, and so long as the right hon. Gentleman remained obdurate they were bound to try in turn to get every relaxation of the Resolution that was possible. If the Government intended to make any addition to the number of days allotted it would be advisable that they should say so at once.

Mr. WHITLEY (Halifax) thought the House had already been played with to a considerable extent. Even to-day the Prime Minister had put up one of his supporters to delay the division. ["No."] The noble Lord the Member for Chorley approached the hon. Member for the Kirkdale Division obviously to prevail upon him to speak.

Mr. J. F. HOPE (Sheffield, Brightside) said the conversation to which the hon. Member referred had reference to a private Bill.

Mr. WHITLEY said he would be satisfied if the hon. Member for the Kirkdale Division denied that the noble Lord asked him to speak on the Amendment.

Mr. DAVID MACIVER said the noble Lord spoke to him with reference to the Mersey Docks and Harbour Bill, and nothing else.

Mr. WHITLEY asked whether he was to understand that the noble Lord said nothing with reference to taking part in the debate.

*Mr. DAVID. MACIVER: The noble Lord asked me how long the Mersey Docks and Harbour Bill was likely to take. The conversation had nothing whatever to do with any other matter.

Mr. WHITLEY said that on that statement he was quite willing to withdraw his remark, though he thought there must be some connection between the Mersey Docks Bill and the celebrated warming pan in "Pickwick."

Mr. SPEAKER: This is really not relevant to the question before the House.

Mr. WHITLEY asked whether, inasmuch as time had on various occasions been wasted by deliberate obstruction on the other side, the Prime Minister would guarantee that nothing of the kind would be allowed during the short period allotted to the Report stage. The right hon. Gentleman appeared to be quite willing to cut down the time, and at the same time to allow hours to be wasted by his own supporters at the commencement of the sitting and immediately after dinner. Many Members were perfectly prepared to sit after midnight to discuss the Bill, and that, he thought, was a very fair offer to make. But there was not much chance of the offer being accepted, as they all knew what happened in connection with the Budget when arrangements had been made for a late sitting. The Prime Minister's own supporters failed him——

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the hon. Member will address himself in a businesslike way to the question before the House.

Mr. WHITLEY said that when there were other methods by which business could be got through it made one feel very strongly with reference to the course of action adopted by the right hon. Gentleman. However, it was no good arguing the matter with the Government; they had made up their minds that the Bill should not be discussed, but he thought the Opposition had given clear notice that they would not recognise any Parliamentary title whatever in the decisions come to under such circumstances.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE pointed out that in connection with the Home Rule Bill two closure Resolutions were proposed—one dealing with Committee, and the other, moved when the Committee stage was concluded, with Report. That, he thought, was the more businesslike way of proceeding, because until the Committee stage had been dealt with, it was impossible to say how long was required for the consideration of questions left undiscussed. For instance, on Clauses 2 and 3, the most important Amendments would be at the end of Clause 2 and the beginning of Clause 3. They would all be left over, because the questions to be dealt with at the beginning of Clause 2 were of such substance that they could not be passed unnoticed. The Prime Minister was too apt to forget that, in addition to being the Leader of a Party, he was also the Leader of the House of Commons, in which position it was his duty, after the conclusion of the Committee stage, to go through the questions undiscussed, and to allot to their consideration such a period of time as, based upon an impartial consideration of their importance, would suffice for their proper discussion. But that could not be done until the Committee stage was concluded, and one could see what questions remained untouched. It was found in connection with the Home Rule Bill that a separate Resolution for the Report stage did not involve a great expenditure of time, but it enabled a much better use to be made of the period allotted to discussion, as the House knew exactly the questions they had still to consider. The Prime Minister said that the Opposition were making contradictory Resolutions, but the right hon. Gentleman appeared to forget that the Amendment to omit the Committee stage had been rejected. Consequently they were entitled to plead for freedom of debate at some stage of this Bill. If the Government had resolved that there should be no discussion on the Committee stage, surely they ought to allow ample discussion upon the Report stage. Even the hon. and gallant Member for Clare suggested that if the Members of the Opposition would wait until the Report stage the Government might consider it advisable to allow more time for that stage of the Bill. Seeing that the Government had not responded to that appeal, all they could do now was to protest at every stage of this Resolution and take the opinion of the House upon it with a view of afterwards taking the opinion of the country.

Dr. HUTCHINSON (Sussex, Rye) said he was returned as a Member of the House of Commons about fifteen months ago, and a licence was then given to him to take part in the debates in the House. That licence was now being taken away from him by this Resolution for no ill-conduct, and he wanted to know what compensation the Prime Minister was going to give him for taking away his licence. A great many important sections of the community had been heard upon this Bill, including the representatives of the Bishops, the clergy, and also the teetotalers, sitting on the Opposition side of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member must confine himself to the Amendment, and he is not at liberty to make a speech upon the Bill generally.

DR. HUTCHINSON said that he had no intention of discussing the Bill generally, and all he wanted to bring in at the end was that there was another small section of the community in this country who had not had their say in regard to this Bill—he meant the medical profession. [MINISTERIAL laughter.] Hon. Members opposite laughed now at the mention of the medical profession, but the moment would come to every Member of the House when he would not want either Prime Ministers or Colonial Secretaries, and when the one man he would want would be a medical man. Hon. Members would probably remember the lines of the poet:—

God and the doctor men adore,
When sickness comes, but not before;
When health returns and ills are righted,
God is forgotten, the doctor slighted.

If there was one body of men more than another who were brought face to face with this question it was the medical profession, and he thought that ample time ought to be given so that the voice of that section of the community for whom he spoke could be heard upon this Bill.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 258; Noes, 188. (Division List No. 190).

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W. Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Lt. Col. H. F. (Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John.
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh)
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc)
Chaplin, Rt. Hon Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Rt. Hn. Sir John C. R
Colston, Chas. Edw. W. Athole
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hn. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Denny, Colonel
Dewar, Sir T. R. (Tower Hamlets
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
FitzRoy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, James (Staffords. N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Hoult, Joseph

Houston, Robert Paterson
Hozier,Hon.James HenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jeffreys,Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kennaway,Rt.Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo.T.(Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Kerr, John
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence,Wm.F. (Liverpool)
Lawson,John Grant(YorksN.R
Lee,Arthur H.(Hants.Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood,Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.Charles W.(Evesham)
Long,Rt.Hn. Walter (Bristol,S)
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas,Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Iver,Sir Lewis(EdinburghW
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hon.W.F.
Maxwell, RtHnSir H.E(Wigt'n
Maxwell,W.J.H (Dumfresshire
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell, William (Burnley)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Moore, William
Morgan,DavidJ.(Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray
Murray,Rt.Hn.A.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Peel,Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, S. Ford (Bethnal Green
Ritchie,Rt.Hn.Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robinson, Brooke
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel,Sir HarryS.(Limehouse
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith,Abel H. (Hertford,East)
Smith,H.C(North'mb.Tyneside
Spencer, Sir E.(W. Bromwich)
Stanley,Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley,Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley,Rt.Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart,Sir Mark J.M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby,Lt.Col.A.C.E. (Taunton
Welby,Sir Charles G.E.(Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley,H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wills, Sir Frederick
Wilson, A. Stanley (York,E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd,Sir W.H.(Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, HenryWilson
Wortley,Rt.Hn. C.B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beaumont, Wentworth C.B.
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin,CharlesRamsay(Galway
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice,Capt EC(S.Andrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans,Sir FrancisH(Maidstone
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R.C. Munro (Leith)
Field, William
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert J.
Goddard, Daniel Ford

Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hn. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hain, Edward
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Rt Hn Sir W (Monm'th
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W.
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leamy, Edmund
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh, N.)
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Murphy, John
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Doherty, William
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Stevensonl Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Chas, Henry (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Yoxall and Mr. Samuel Evans.

MR. SPEAKER stated that a number of Amendments of which notice had been given proposing alterations in line 2 of the Resolution were not in order. The next Amendment which was in order stood in name of the hon. Member for North-West Lanarkshire.

MR. CHARLES DOUGLAS (Lanarkshire, N.W.), who had given notice of an Amendment to leave out "on six allotted days" in line 3, asked if he might move to leave out the word "on," reserving other questions to be dealt with by subsequent Amendments.

MR. SPEAKER said the object of the hon. Member's Amendment, and also of several others, was really to get rid of the word "six."

MR. CHARLES DOUGLAS said there was a more general object in the Amendment, namely, not to decide at this stage how many days were to be occupied, but to reserve that point for a later period.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member's Amendment is to leave out "on six allotted days." The other Amendments are to leave out "six" and to substitute certain other numbers. In each case the object is to get rid of the word "six."

MR. CHARLES DOUGLAS said he would not move his Amendment.

DR. MACNAMARA moved to leave out "six" in line 3, and insert "eighteen." He was most anxious that they should have an opportunity of pressing the Prime Minister to make some extension of the number of days. He would remind the right hon. Gentleman that many of his supporters had very great misgivings in voting with him for closure by compartments, and with the exception of two they had strongly urged him to widen the scheme of compartments. The right hon. Gentleman had based his proposal to some extent on precedents set by his own and preceding Governments. But there was nothing in these precedents anything like so drastic as the scheme now proposed. In connection with the Crimes Bill of 1887 they had fifteen days in Committee before the closure by compartments scheme was brought forward. The Home Rule Bill had been twenty-eight days in Committee before closure by compartments was proposed. On the Education Bill of 1902 they were thirty-eight days in Committee before closure by compartments was enforced, and then seven days in Committee alone were given, and four days on Report, while the Third Reading was left entirely out of the time limit. After citing these facts he thought the right hon. Gentleman would see that there was no case in which the closure by compartments had been moved so soon and so closely, and with so short an amount of time between the Committee and Report stage. And there was no precedent for taking the closure on the Third Reading. In regard to this Bill, they had been told that it had been thirty-four hours in Committee. He thought that that was not quite correct. It had been only thirty hours in Committee. The right hon. Gentleman proposed to give four days more, one of which must be a Friday—which would only be five hours for that day—and two days for Report, and one of these days would also be a Friday, which would amount to twelve and a half hours. That would mean that thirty-seven and a half hours would be given for discussion under closure by compartments. Then, on the Third Reading there was to be one day, or seven and a half hours. The total time, therefore, occupied by the Bill from beginning to end, with the closure by compartments and prior to its being enforced, would, roughly speaking, be seventy-five hours. Could the Prime Minister honestly say that that was enough ?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR : Do you include the First and Second Readings ?

Dr. MACNAMARA said no. But he would take twenty-five hours for the First and Second Readings and that would make 100 hours. Did the Prime Minister tell the House that 100 hours for all the stages for this Bill was anything approaching a reasonable time in which to discuss it ? He moved his Motion because substantially every speaker, with the exception of two on the right hon. Gentleman's own side of the House, was in favour of a more generous extension of the time limit, and no precedent had been put forward for so drastic a scheme as this. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 3, to leave out the word 'six,' and insert the word 'eighteen."—(*Dr. Macnamara.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'six' stand part of the Question."

*Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) said he desired to second the Amendment. He was very glad to find that the hon. Member had increased the time of his proposal from ten to eighteen days, which made the Amendment equivalent to what he himself intended to have moved. The hon. Member had talked about precedents, but he was afraid that this was not so much a matter of precedent, as that the Government imagined that for their own sakes they must pass this Bill into law under conditions which would limit the session to the 12th of August. The conditions could leave no doubt in the mind of any clear-minded person that this discussion was to be crowded into an altogether inadequate period. The questions which had been raised were of enormous importance, and the idea of suppressing the discussion on Clauses 2 and 3 into one day was perfectly absurd. The questions arising on these clauses were of such far-reaching importance that the House ought to have several days in which to discuss them adequately. If the time fixed were ten days it would even then be inadequate, but if it were eighteen days it would give them a much better chance of adequate discussion.

Mr. COHEN (Islington, E.) said he had listened to the speech of the hon. Member for North Camberwell, with admiration, because the hon. Member had suggested what he thought would have been a valuable argument for a reasonable Amendment. But it was ridiculous to suggest that the extension of the time limit should be not from six to ten days, but to eighteen days. He himself hoped that the Prime Minister would extend the time limit proposed, but the Amendment of the hon. Member, if he insisted upon it, was calculated to defeat the end he had in view.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton) said they ought not to be afraid to ask the House of Commons to sit for twelve more days. They ought to understand really what they were passing. He did not believe that anyone who read the Bill through knew what it meant. The senior Member for Oldham had spoken of the discussion on Clauses 2 and 3 being pressed into one day. He had made a calculation as to how many hours they would have to discuss these two clauses of this revolutionary measure. They would have from three o'clock to 7.30, which was four and a half hours for the most important clause in the Bill, because it endeavoured to show what amount of compensation would be obtained for the refusal of a licence. It was perfectly evident to any fair-minded and reasonable man that it was absolutely impossible for the House to discuss that important clause in four and a half hours. Speeches might be limited as much as they pleased, but not half of the Amendments, even from the Government side of the House, would be reached. Seventeen of the Amendments on Clause 2 were proposed by hon. Gentlemen opposite. If each Gentlemen occupied a quarter of an hour the whole of the time would have been exhausted. He asked the Prime Minister himself if he quite knew how much this Bill was going to increase the value of the licensed property of the country. Nobody had been able to tell them. They had had various estimates ranging from £100,000,000 to over £300,000,000. The vital Amendment which would give some information as to the amount of compensation that was to be paid ought certainly not be scamped. Many good supporters of the Government, including its most pathetic supporters, the Member for Plymouth, the right hon. Member for Oxford, the hon. and learned Member for Stretford, and the right hon. Member for East Somerset, one of the most reasonable Members of the House, wanted an extension of time. But it was impossible for their Amendments to be reached if the Prime Minister's proposal to devote only four and a half hours to this compartment were carried. The whole thing was a mockery and a sham. He asked the Prime Minister in the interests not only of his own Bill but of the dignity of the House to give a fair amount of time for the discussion of this important matter. He was sure the right hon. Gentlemen's own constituents would not blame him if he said that he was going to make the House of Commons sit from the 12th to the 24th August in order to get the Licensing Bill discussed in a proper and workmanlike fashion. He therefore trusted the right hon. Gentleman would assent to the Amendment of his hon. friend.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that when the hon. Member talked about the absurdity of asking the House to pass such a Resolution, it showed that he was a very young Member of the House. He could not have taken part in the proceedings in regard to the closure on the Home Rule Bill.

MR. LAMBERT : Certainly I did.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR : Do my ears deceive me ? Does the hon. Gentleman say he was present and yet talk about the dignity of the House and the absurdity of the present discussion of two clauses in one day ?

MR. LAMBERT said he did not think the right hon. Gentleman would find a precedent in the Home Rule Bill discussion which compressed a single clause into four and a half hours.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that when the hon. Gentleman talked about the dignity of the House of Commons and of the absurdity of asking the House to discuss the questions which would be included in these compartments within the limit of time proposed, he certainly could not have taken part in the proceedings on the great closure of the Home Rule Bill by Mr. Gladstone.

Mr. LAMBERT: Oh, yes I did, and I voted for it.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: And yet the hon. Member talks about the dignity of the House and the absurdity of compressing Clauses 1 and 2 of the Licensing Bill into one day.

Mr. LAMBERT: I do not think the right hon. Gentleman will find a single precedent in the Home Rule Bill closure for compressing a single clause into four hours and a half.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he thought the hon. Gentleman had quite forgotten what the closure on the Home Rule Bill did. He would remind the hon. Gentleman that the Home Rule Bill proposed to give a new Constitution not only to this country but to Ireland, and that among the things which were not discussed because they were stopped by closure was the composition of the Irish Legislative Chamber, and of the Irish Legislative Council, and what was to be done in the case of disagreements between those two hypothetical bodies. All that was in the first compartment. He had described yesterday what happened in the second compartment, in which no less than eighteen clauses, each one of which was a Bill in itself, were compressed into five days. The hon. Gentleman might truly say that that was a different arrangement from this. Mr. Gladstone, naturally enough, and he thought he should have done the same thing in his place, thought it more convenient to have big batches of clauses stuck into compartments of four or five days, rather than, as he had now done with a very limited Bill, to have the compartments more restricted in length and the subjects much smaller. But if the hon. Gentleman would do the simple sum in arithmetic to which he had called attention yesterday, he would see that to discuss eighteen clauses in five days was to require the discussion of more than three clauses *per diem* on an average, and those clauses were not unimportant; they were not machinery clauses, but clauses connected with the constitution of a wholly new organic law.

Mr. LAMBERT: We had a mandate and you have not.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Does the hon Gentleman say that his Party had a mandate for squeezing all these clauses into five days?

Mr. LAMBERT: A mandate for the Home Rule——

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: That is not what we are arguing; but whether the House can discuss a given subject in a given time. On that point, which was the only one before them, the hon. Gentleman was good enough to say that the Government had been totally regardless of the dignity of the House, and had made utterly absurd proposals. He was pointing out that if the dignity of the House was affected by this proposal ten thousand times more was Mr. Gladstone's closure open to the same charge.

Mr. LAMBERT: We sat till September.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said the hon. Gentleman's point, as he understood it, was that they were restricting discussion, but he did not think he need deal with that part of the subject at greater length. In the speech in which he introduced this Motion he had even hinted that he thought this method of closure by compartments an extremely clumsy method of procedure, and it was his firm conviction that some day this question would have to be taken in hand, and they would have to find some more flexible and more convenient method by which the time of the House should be allocated as between the different elements of the Government programme. The difficulties were obviously enormous. because, to start with, they must have a Government programme which was reasonable in dimensions; he did not mean to say, of course, reasonable in substance, because to an Opposition no Government programme was reasonable in substance. Then they would have to find some mechanism for allocating the debates so that every question of importance should be debated and no trivial question debated. Alas, they were far from that now, and he did not deny that the evils inherent in this method of dealing with business affected the proposals he had made to the House, as they had affected the other proposals of a similar kind made in the past, and as they doubtless would affect other proposals of that kind made in the future. Until that great reform or alteration which he had adumbrated was accepted by that Assembly, which he supposed was in some respects, as regarded its rules, the most conservative Assembly in the world, and, while admitting frankly that his proposals were open to objection, he asked whether they should not under the circumstances be passed. He had considered and reconsidered the matter, and he sympathised with the desire of some hon. Members that there should be an extension of time, though not to the extent proposed in the Amendment, which was extreme even to absurdity. Given that the House had already decided that there should be a time limit to this Bill, on the whole he was inclined to think that the House would be well-advised to adhere to the limits originally laid down by the Government. By the addition of a few hours he did not believe any advantage would be secured to the Opposition, who had already announced their intention of not feeling themselves bound by this Bill. He did not think that in any circumstances they would be bound, but at all events no change in their attitude could be expected in return for anything in the nature of a slight modification of the scheme, which, after careful thought, he had laid on the Table of the House. They must have regard to the whole circumstances of the session. As far as he was concerned he certainly did not wish to overburden the House, but, even with any diminution which he might be able to make in the Government programme, he did not think it would be possible for them to rise before the day on which as a rule they had been able to rise during the last eight years, and even then he thought he was understating the case. Having regard to all those circumstances, much would be lost and nothing gained by any attempt to modify the Resolution he had moved. He had come to the conclusion with reluctance, but he hoped at all events his friends on that side would feel that it was through no desire for rash and arbitrary proceedings that he had taken the course he had. He was convinced it was the course which, on the whole, would be most useful in the public interests, and in the interests of the House and of the Members.

SIR ROBERT REID said he would not follow the Prime Minister into his forecast as to the period of the session, nor with regard to the precedent of the Home Rule Bill. The right hon. Gentleman at the time expressed his disapproval in warm terms of that precedent; and what was the use of bringing it forward now, unless, as he did not believe, the Prime Minister was stating deliberately what he thought to be unjust, wrong, and unfair. The right hon. Gentleman apparently indicated, just now, that there might be some possible willingness on his part to make a concession, if an indication were given of any change of temper and disposition on the part of the Opposition. He had two thoughts in reference to the Licensing Bill in connection with the Prime Minister. The first was that, with all his avocations, the right hon. Gentleman had not been able to penetrate to the core of the Bill. It was only after considerable study of its voluminous and important innovations that one could understand how deep it struck, and how dangerous it might be. His other thought with regard to the Prime Minister was that he did not realise the state of feeling in reference to the Bill. It appeared to be an axiom with regard to licensing legislation that every teetotaler was an extreme man; but many who were not teetotalers regarded the Bill as full of the gravest possible dangers. If the right hon. Gentleman realised that, he would not have talked about a few days more or less in comparison with the convenience of the House. No one wanted to overwork Ministers, or to deprive Members generally of the opportunity of enjoying some part of the summer in the country; but nothing of that kind was comparable to the vast questions involved in the Bill. It touched the liquor traffic and the licensing system at every point, as all experts could assure the right hon. Gentleman. The question was whether the time proposed was sufficient to allow the House to properly discuss the Bill. The Prime Minister did not say that it was sufficient. He did not think that the Prime Minister, as a gentleman of honour and as one responsible to the

House and the country for such an important change in the law, would say that he really believed that the time proposed was sufficient. The right hon. Gentleman, however, seemed to think that there was some overwhelming necessity for curtailing discussion in order to wind up the session. That was neither a statesmanlike nor a fair attitude on the part of the Leader of the House. In the first clause there were sixteen points of far-reaching importance, and they would have to be discussed in one day. Supposing the Committee wished to divide on these points, the divisions alone, without any discussion whatever, would take three hours. He excluded any suspicion, although he did not know why he should, that those who wished to prevent any changes in the tenor of the Bill would occupy their time in discussing earlier and less important points. That was a danger that had to be faced. All this had to be dealt with in one day, and the same observation might be made with regard to the other clauses as a whole. The whole Bill from beginning to end was to be passed through the Report stage in two days. Discussion was impossible under such conditions. The Prime Minister had, however, refused to make any concession, although for his part he thought eighteen days would be very usefully occupied in discussing the measure. He felt that there was at stake something even more serious than the Bill. The House of Commons would not remain a deliberative assembly of any practical value if a limitation of this kind upon its time was imposed. The Prime Minister had not said that he believed the time allowed was sufficient, and he had given no reason for his proposal other than the convenience of Members of the House. He ventured to submit that that was not an attitude which the Prime Minister ought to take up.

Mr. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.) agreed that the Prime Minister was not likely to win gratitude from the Opposition, no matter how much time he might give for the discussion of the Bill. But there was something else than the gratitude of the Opposition; there was the decency of debate and the satisfaction of the country. The majority of the people of the country consisted of moderate men, who would be much better satisfied with the Bill if they knew that it had been adequately discussed in the House of Commons. It would greatly assit hon. Members to explain to their constituents the attitude taken up by the Government if more time were allowed for discussion. Assuming that the Resolution were passed that day, to-morrow would be the first allotted day and Friday next would be the second allotted day, and they would have to dispose of Clauses 2 and 3 in four and a half hours. When Estimates were before the House Friday was never considered a whole day, and he submitted that it would not be fair to make it an allotted day in this case. Clauses 2 and 3 covered the whole question of compensation, a most debateable question, on which strong feelings were held throughout the country, and a question on which great doubt and obscurity prevailed in the House as to what the Bill itself actually meant. He asked whether the Prime Minister could not give one or two full days for that most important subject.

Mr. McKENNA said the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had spoken in so moderate and temperate a manner that in an ordinary case they might have hoped that the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister would have made the concession for which he had been asked, but the House had to remember that the most important parts of the Bill had not been discussed, and when the right hon. Member for Somerset pointed out that Clauses 2 and 3 would be discussed on Friday next, he put his finger not on the weak but on the strong spot. They were not intended to be discussed. There was on the Paper an Amendment put down on the part of the Government in respect of compensation. Why was not that in the Bill itself? They could pretty well gather the reason why it was put down now. It was put down because of an election that was now taking place. In the request he had made, the right hon. Gentleman was asking the Government to forego the main ground for their proposal. The Prime Minister had guaranteed that the difficult question which might divide the publican from the brewer should not be raised, and that it should only be from bitter experience of the working of the measure, after the general election, that the publican should find out that it was disastrous to him. Six days only were to be given to the House to dispose of a great public property. A property estimated at £300,000,000 was to be given away to the trade, and the right hon. Gentleman suggested that that was a reasonable proposal to make. What sort of a title were the brewers to get under this Bill? The right hon. Gentleman quoted the precedent of the Home Rule Bill, but the right hon. Gentleman and his friends then relied on another place to reject the measure on the ground that it had not been adequately discussed. They could not rely on another place on this occasion, but they would ask the judgment of the people upon the Parliamentary title which the Prime Minister was giving the brewers to a great public property estimated at £300,000,000 sterling. He was satisfied that the right hon. Gentleman was doing a bad day's business for the brewers by this procedure, because he was giving the country, and a future Government, a reason for upsetting that Parliamentary title. The Prime Minister was going beyond all precedents; he was limiting discussion, taking away the liberties of Members, and transferring public property; and the effect of his action would be to destroy the value which had hitherto attached to a Parliamentary title.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES expressed his regret that the debate had started and was being continued on the lines of Party recrimination. The Prime Minister had spoken of the proceedings of the House becoming "wearisome and nauseous." Personally, when he heard these accusations bandied about from one side to the other he felt not weariness, but attenuation, and not nausea, but the next disagreeable stage which sometimes followed upon it. He began to doubt whether, in any discussion whatever, it would be possible to keep Ministers to the merits of the question at issue; certainly these Party recriminations were not relevant, and they did not add to the usefulness of the debates. He was sorry to hear the Prime Minister predict another dose of new rules. He would have thought the right hon. Gentleman's experience in that direction would have deterred him from making another attempt. It was because the new rules had failed in their purpose that the present Resolution had been brought forward. The proposal before the House was no ordinary "closure by compartments." No dates whatever were fixed; the days were to be chosen by the right hon. Gentleman himself, and might be sandwiched in wherever the Prime Minister pleased. There was no security that the allotted days would not go beyond even the sacred 12th August, which the right hon. Gentleman appeared to worship in his most secret devotions The Amendment proposed to treble the number of days on which Members were to be placed absolutely at the command of the Government; therefore he would prefer six to eighteen. If the word "six" were agreed to, it would be useless to urge any subsequent extension of time for a particular stage of the Bill, as whatever was added to one portion would have to be taken from another. But it was evident that the Prime Minister had finally determined that the number of days should be six and no more. Friday was not likely to be one of the allotted days, as the right hon. Gentleman's supporters were usually in the country on that day golfing or motoring. Monday also was likely to be exempt, as hon. Members were not generally in attendance with sufficient strength to save the Government without the assistance of the Peckham janissaries. The determination to adhere to the proposed number of days, and to the system of scattering those days at will over the remainder of the session, was an absolute avowal that there was no urgency for the passing of the Bill.

Sir EDWARD GREY (Northumberland, Berwick) shared the impatience of the hon. Member for Lynn Regis with regard to the use of the *tu quoque* argument, especially on the part of the Prime Minister. The *tu quoque* argument, to be effective at all, should compare like with like, but there was no comparison whatever between the Home Rule Bill, to which the right hon. Gentleman had referred, and the measure now concerned. In the former case the Opposition had made it perfectly clear that they would not seriously debate the measure before the House; in the present case nothing of the sort had happened. The speech of the hon. Member the present Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board alone was a justification for strong measures in connection with the Home Rule Bill. The Prime Minister persistently ignored the fact that so far as the Committee stage in the Licensing Bill had gone, the division of speeches was nearly equal between the two sides of the House, and that certainly was not the case with the Home Rule Bill. He had little hope of influencing the Prime Minister, as the Bill was not really in his mind. It was not the convenience of the House, but the convenience of his own side of the House, that the right hon. Gentleman was considering. The Bill had to be forced through while he could count on their support. It was that fact that created the great gulf between the Opposition and the Prime Minister. The right hon. Gentleman had not gauged what the opposition to the Bill really was. The measure filled the minds of many Members with despair. Its scope was not merely large; it was eternal; and for the consideration of such a measure a fixed limit of six days was to be allotted. If there was to be any discussion at all, six days was an absurdly inadequate period. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Somersetshire had made an appeal as a moderate man. Now, if ever, was the opportunity for moderate men to assert themselves. The country was beginning to feel that appeals from "moderate men" had fallen rather flat. The "moderate men" were coming to be looked upon as those who contented themselves with expressing their opinion but never enforcing it. One man might play a useful part, as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Somersetshire had often done but moderate men were of no use unless they acted in bulk. Never had moderate men been at such a discount in public life as at present. Let them show the House what they could do in the way of securing time for the adequate discussion of this Bill. It was true that the Prime Minister would not gain the gratitude of the Opposition by extending the period by two or three days, but that was because he had shown no disposition to accept reasonable Amendments to the Bill. Further discussion was useless unless it was to be accompanied by a reasonable spirit in the conduct of the Bill. The rigid and ruthless attitude taken up by the Prime Minister made any gratitude on the part of the Opposition impossible. If the Government used their majority to pass this Bill as it stood in order to secure immunity from discussion, he agreed that under those circumstances the Opposition would not consider themselves bound by this Bill.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said his right hon. friend the Member for East Somersetshire addressed an appeal to him not to make Friday one of the allotted days.

Mr. HENRY HOBHOUSE: Not to make Friday the second allotted day.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said there were certain Amendments on the Paper raising this question in which the right hon. Gentleman took a great interest. If it would meet the general views of the House, he would undertake that Friday should not be one of the allotted days.

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said this was the most important Amendment they had got to discuss. With regard to the precedent of the Home Rule Bill, which had been quoted by the Prime Minister, he wished to point out that that was the twenty-sixth Home Rule Bill passed by the House of Commons. There were twenty-five other Home Rule Bills before that, and none of them were closured. The effect of the last closure moved by the Prime Minister in regard to the Education Bill ought not to be overlooked. It had caused so much commotion in the country that they might almost say that they had been plunged into a small revolution. In consequence of the discussion having been cut short on the Education Bill 22,000 summonses had been issued under that Act, 1 000 seizures of goods had been made, and twenty or thirty people had been sent to prison. He invited the Prime Minister to look at the important results which had been achieved by the discussion which had already taken place upon the first three lines of the Bill. During that discussion the character of the public-house as a place of refreshment had been entirely altered, and there had also been an Amendment put down by the Government dealing with the distribution of compensation. Every argument brought forward by the Opposition on these questions was rejected at first, and after the debate when the country and the Government came to consider the question they found a long Amendment down on the Paper which entirely altered the position. That result showed that large issues might arise when they came to a close discussion of the Bill. They were being asked to dispose of the whole Committee stage in four days, and he appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to allow more time for the discussion of the details. He was aware that the right hon. Gentleman had to do his duty by the Party which supported him, but he had almost admitted that he was forcing matters too much and that the time was too short. Finally the right hon. Gentleman stated that his reason for not making any concession was that the Opposition would not be grateful. Why should they be grateful because they were constantly being ground down by the Government. If the Prime Minister felt that the time he was allowing was too short and the speeches would be too long he owed it to the position he occupied to widen that time.

SIR JOHN GORST (Cambridge University) pointed out that if the six allotted days were adhered to there would be one matter which would not be discussed at all and that was the amount of compensation. That was a very vital question in the Bill, because it was giving away what was the property of the people themselves. Therefore, this was a question which ought not to be settled without adequate discussion. As matters stood now this important question would never be discussed at all. There were numerous Amendments down and nobody appeared to know what the Government proposal really meant. He was quite sure that few lawyers would be able to interpret what the clause meant. The Amendments put down to Clause 2 came at the end, and therefore they had no chance of being reached. This method of closure by compartments was a clumsy one; it did not secure that the time allotted for discussion should be devoted to the more important Amendments, and the whole of the time might be wasted upon Amendments of less importance. That was the usual result of the operation of the closure. On the first allotted day of the Report stage, the new clauses, and then Clauses 1, 2, and 3, were to be taken, and under those circumstances what chance was there of Amendments relating to compensation being discussed? If those Amendments were not discussed, the Bill would part with a valuable property belonging to the people of this country, and would vest that property in the trade—[MINISTERIAL cries of "No, no!"]—and they would do that without the representatives of the people having had the opportunity of discussing or considering this question. That was what would happen, and it would be a perfect scandal. What the value of the property was which was going to be disposed of in this way nobody was able to say. Some eminent gentlemen estimated its value at £3,000,000, but, at any rate, the rise in the value of brewery shares, in consequence of the expectation that this Bill would pass, amounted to more than £1,000,000. Therefore, they might take it that the property at stake amounted to several millions, which was to be divided between the trade and the people, and the latter had a right to expect that their representatives would be heard upon it. He asked the Prime Minister to so modify the terms of this Resolution as to secure that part of the allotted time should be devoted to the discussion of this most important question, which he did not think the Government, or those who represented the interests of the brewers in this House, would deny was a matter of extreme importance. He had always supported the idea of doing perfect justice to those engaged in the trade, but surely the question of how much was to be given was one which ought to be discussed and upon which the representatives of the people ought to have the opportunity of expressing their views.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH (Anglesey) said that the discussion which had already taken place must have convinced everybody that the case against the Government was overwhelming. He did not think that the Prime Minister for a moment would suggest that the Bill could be adequately discussed in the time placed at their disposal under this Resolution. The issue they had to discuss now was whether there was any necessity to limit the discussion to six days. The speeches from both sides of the House must have convinced the right hon. Gentleman that the Bill could not be adequately discussed in the time at their disposal. He was not going to take part in the argument about precedents, except to say that the Prime Minister had used strong language on that subject. In 1894, speaking upon a similar Resolution, the right hon. Gentleman said—

> "Indulge in this petty and sordid trafficking for votes if you like, but do not ask us to help you to make the honour and the dignity and the traditions of this House counters in the sorry game you are playing for political support."

Was this Bill not a petty sordid trafficking for votes? Why should the right hon. Gentleman expect them to assist him in arriving at a satisfactory agreement with brewers for whom this Bill was intended? There was no necessity resting upon the Prime Minister to compress the discussion into six days. His complaint against the Prime Minister was twofold—first of all that he did not begin the Bill early enough, and, secondly, that he would not go on late enough. The discussion was to be bounded on one side by Ascot, and on the other side by grouse shooting. That was the necessity which compelled him to limit the discussion to six days. There was really no necessity that the House should rise on the 12th of August. He noticed that in 1894 the present Prime Minister spoke of there being something more important than personal ease and convenience. He had not heard the right hon. Gentleman speak of anything so important as the ease and convenience of his own followers. He submitted that if the Prime Minister was in earnest in wanting a serious discussion of this measure the only way he could have it was to let the House sit a week or so beyond the usual allotted time. If he could get his own followers to do that he need not trouble about the Opposition side of the House in the event of his granting that concession. The right hon. Gentleman might depend upon their being at their posts.

Mr. TRITTON (Lambeth, Norwood) said many hon. Members thought six days too short a time for the discussion of this measure, and he would ask the Prime Minister to consider the appeal made to him by the hon. Member for East Somerset and to see whether he could not give one or two more days.

Mr. CHARLES DOUGLAS said he was afraid they must give up hope of getting any concession from the Prime Minister. The right hon. Gentleman had founded himself on what he was pleased to call precedent, and he had done so wisely because there was nothing in which he was happier than in defending the attitude he had taken up. Possibly he believed it made it right if he showed how it was parallel to actions which at other times he had condemned in the strongest terms. The Prime Minister said at an earlier stage of the discussion that they should take each case entirely on its merits. They had not got clearly from the Prime Minister what his opinion was of the merits of this case. The right hon. Gentleman had never argued throughout his speeches that this Bill could be adequately discussed in the time he had allotted for its discussion. They must make clear the ground on which they opposed his action. It was impossible for them to discuss the Bill in the time allowed to them. He would name a few of the subjects which still remained to be discussed. They were still discussing the delimitation of the spheres of the two licensing authorities. They had to consider a matter which in the Licensing Act for Scotland last year the Government did not think unworthy of attention—the introduction of a representative element into the licensing authority. They had to consider a matter which in the minds of temperance reformers had always been connected with any question of compensation—that was the statutory reduction of licences and the establishment of a maximum ratio of licences to population. Reference had already been made to the quite inadequate time allowed for the discussion of compensation. Nobody knew precisely what the proposal of the Bill was. They would certainly not have time to approach, in the days allowed by the Prime Minister, the questions that had to be dealt with under compensation, for the compensation method which this Bill adopted could not, as had already been made quite apparent in the discussion, be isolated, and taken by itself, and separated from the larger questions in relation to licences. The moment the question of compensation was introduced they came at once into contact with large social questions raised by our licensing system. The Bill raised questions which could not be settled within the narrow limits set down in the Resolution. Another set of questions on which there had been practically no discussion were those raised by Clause 4 as to the treatment and disposition of new licences. Under the Resolution these questions were to be dealt with in a single day. It was impossible to maintain that that was adequate time for their discussion. Then there were questions as to whether there should be a system of high licence, or whether a system of disinterested public management was to be adopted—questions which ought to be dealt with in a Bill which was to revolutionise and set up side by side with the old licences a different tenure for new licences. These were questions which the Government proposed they should deal with in perhaps four-and-a-half hours. It was impossible to legislate properly on these matters in the time allowed for discussion by the Resolution. On these grounds they felt bound to press for very different limits from those which were suggested.

On the Opposition side of the House they could not hope for concessions from the Prime Minister, but supporters of the Government should endeavour to obtain from him some concessions, for they had said in plain terms that they did not believe the time allowed to be adequate. Their methods were not sufficiently active to be successful with the Prime Minister. On the Opposition side of the House they had often regarded the supporters of the Government as good men struggling with adversity, but the complaint they felt bound to make now was that in the present instance they were not even struggling. They had object lessons before their eyes as to how the Prime Minister could be moved. They knew how different was the treatment accorded to hon. Members from Ireland and Scotland in matters relating to the management of the business of the House. He would take another instance. Let them compare the treatment accorded to tariff reformers with that given to free-traders. Let them remember the great precedent of what perhaps he might be allowed to call the "Wharton Amendment," when 112 staunch men sent a stern message to the Prime Minister and got their way. He did not know whether there were 112 temperance reformers on the other side, but a much smaller number would serve. He was quite sure that if they would let their minds be clearly known and make it appear that they had wills they would also get a little of their own way. He was afraid that they still harboured the delusion that the Prime Minister was amenable to kindness. Many of the lower animals were ruled by kindness, but the teaching of history was that very few Prime Ministers indeed, and certainly not the present Prime Minister, responded to such treatment. He urged his hon. friends opposite not to be satisfied with the two hours they had already obtained so far, but to push for very much more in the direction of what was required.

*Mr. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.) said he did not rise for the purpose of making any appeal to the Prime Minister. This debate had been left to moderate men, and he should be very anxious to see the result of it. He rose for the purpose of calling attention from the historical aspect to the futility of all these proceedings. Let them take the precedent of the Evicted Tenants Bill. The precedent of the Evicted Tenants Bill had been quoted. The Prime Minister resisted the closure of that Bill in 1895. It would be interesting for hon. Gentlemen who expended a great deal of eloquence against the closuring of that Bill to remember that this Government had as the result of that closuring settled the evicted tenants question nine years afterwards on far more liberal terms than had been proposed by the right hon. Member for Montrose. Take the Parnell Commission. That was closured by the right hon. Gentlemen on his own side of the House. It was discussed at great length—far longer than this Bill had been discussed—and those extreme proposals discussed at inordinate length he admitted did not serve any good purpose whatever. They settled nothing. They left everything unsettled and Mr. Parnell emerged from that scene absolutely triumphant. Take the Home Rule Bill. It was discussed for eighty-two days. This Bill had been discussed thirty-four hours. It was closured and the present Ministerialist Party resisted the closure. Could hon. Gentlemen devise a better means of bringing about Home Rule than by making that House into a machine. That was all they got by passing those closuring Resolutions. Take the Education Bill, discussed for thirty-eight days and closured at the end of that time. Did hon. Members on the Government side believe that the education question was settled by that closure? Did not everybody know that the education question would rise at the next general election and Members would have to answer for what they did? Not one of those violent measures produced the result that people thought they produced, and they might depend upon it that in this case it would be the same thing.

What was the plain statement made by right hon. Gentlemen sitting on the Front Opposition Bench? It was said that afternoon by one of the ablest and most far-seeing men who sat on the Bench that this Bill in itself was bad enough, but disposed of as it had been and was proposed to be disposed of further by this Resolution, they owed it no allegiance whatever. Why should hon. Members on the Government Benches proceed to those methods of throttling debate without sufficient discussion? Why should they resort to those methods when the whole history of those things told them that they were absolutely futile and that the people of England could not be controlled as the Government controlled their obedient majority. For his part he had no reason to make any appeal to the right hon. Gentleman, and he rejoiced to think that none of those who were called extreme temperance men had risen that afternoon to make any. He thought the time allotted to the Bill inadequate. He did not believe any Member of the House would contend that six days was adequate for the discussion in Committee. And what followed? Hon. Gentleman were taking upon themselves now, with the funeral knell tolling at every by-election, the responsibility of closuring a Bill without adequate discussion, and they imagined that the people of England were not looking on. What better evidence could the people of England give than they were giving that the Government had outstayed their welcome and that the Government had no moral right to do what they were doing? When the people spoke out like that, not once or twice, but for twelve long months, whenever they got a chance, the best thing the Government could do was to closure themselves and make way for other people.

Sir J. STIRLING-MAXWELL (Glasgow, College) said that this debate was the most dismal he had ever heard in the House. The Prime Minister had no concession to make and there was no expectation of any. In these circumstance, he would like to know whether, if the debate closed now, the Prime Minister would allow them this evening in addition to the six allotted days for the Committee stage. He was quite certain that the right hon. Gentleman had done everything for what he thought was the best, but it was quite impossible to vote for the Resolution for six days, which he believed was quite inadequate for a discussion of that importance.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said he was glad that the hon. Gentleman opposite had come to the conclusion that it was useless to make any further appeals to the Prime Minister on this point, for the simple reason that the right hon. Gentleman was not considering for a moment the time that ought to be allotted from the point of view of the merits of the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman was allowing external considerations to influence him. The Prime Minister was giving the House the number of days in which the whole clauses of the Bill were to be discussed; but had the right hon.

Gentleman really discovered how much time he was giving to the discussion of each clause? He could hardly think so. Take the last day of all in Committee. What was proposed to be discussed was five clauses and two schedules—one of which was in the Bill, and one to be moved by the Home Secretary, which was down on the Amendment Paper. That was practically seven clauses, and how long did the House get to discuss them? Six-and-a-half hours. Supposing they had only one division on each of these clauses—there would be at least one Amendment on each clause—that left five hours for discussion, after one-and-a-half hours had been spent in divisions. Five hours for seven clauses was under fifty minutes for each clause. The right hon. Gentleman worked himself up into a pitch of righteous indignation because the late Government only allowed a day for each clause. What did he think of himself for only allowing fifty minutes for each clause. There was no comparison. He thought they were entitled to ask the Prime Minister, did he mean, upon his authority as Leader of the House, to say that, in his judgment, fifty minutes per clause was adequate? Clause 3 was in the same position. The right hon. Gentleman allowed two or three hours for discussion of Clause 2, and two or three hours for discussion of Clause 3, and for each of the rest of the clauses fifty minutes. They were entitled to ask one simple question. Did the right hon. Gentleman mean sincerely to say that in his judgment fifty minutes was sufficient and adequate? Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman was exercising a wise discretion in refusing to give an answer. He took it by the silence of the Prime Minister that the right hon Gentleman admitted that there was no answer to be given; but he was entitled to an answer to the question.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, no! I do not think the hon. Gentleman is entitled to an answer. It is not a question to be answered across the floor of the House.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: They were not entitled to ask the one question which was relevant to the whole discussion! Surely that was the whole point they were discussing. Were these six days adequate or were they not? The Prime Minister said not merely must they not discuss the point, but that they had no right to ask the question whether the right hon. Gentleman thought the time was adequate or not. He thought that was treating the House of Commons with a measure of contempt that certainly no Leader of the House had ever treated it with before. The only thing he could say was that the mere fact that the House of Commons had stood this sort of thing for session after session, and year after year, showed that the Prime Minister had taken the right measure of the House he led, and it deserved the contempt with which its Leader treated it.

*MR. MALCOLM (Suffolk, Stowmarket) said he thought that the House of Commons had a right to say that if the question of the hon. Member for Carnarvon Burghs was the only revelant question, it ought to have been asked earlier in the afternoon. He was in complete agreement with the Prime Minister in the action he had taken. He thought he had a right to tell hon. Gentlemen opposite how much they were responsible for the *impasse* in which they found themselves at the present time. The hon. Gentleman made a great deal of the fact that Clauses 2 and 3 would have to be discussed on Friday afternoon; but supposing the present Motion had been finished last night, as had been expected, then Clauses 2 and 3, could have been discussed to-morrow. Another way in which hon. Gentlemen opposite were responsible was by not taking trivial Amendments off the Order Paper, and then proceeding to the discussion of the more important Amendments. He agreed with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Berwick Division, who said that all this recrimination was unnecessary. Experience showed that if a Party were determined to kill a Bill, they would succeed, even if thirty days were allowed for the Committee stage. He congratulated his right hon. friend on his Motion; and he hoped he would not accept any Amendments to it. It was perfectly obvious that whether the Opposition had three days, or thirty days, or three months their only desire was to bury the Bill.

They had no desire to better it. They had proclaimed that in the parks; their newspapers were full of their undying hostility to the measure; and yet they now asked the Prime Minister for three or four days more, with which, forsooth, they would be satisfied. It seemed to him that it was all the utmost cant. Hon. Gentlemen opposite wanted to kill the Bill; its promoters wanted to pass it into law. He most earnestly hoped that, that being the position, his right hon. friend would stick to his guns. The speeches on the other side had been very businesslike; but the business was to kill the Bill. The only Amendment he should like to see accepted was the Amendment suggested by the junior Member for Oldham, to strike out six days and substitute one day.

Mr. SAMUEL EVANS said that the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken had mistaken the position of hon. Gentlemen on that side. They did not ask for three or four more days; they demanded proper time for the discussion of the Bill. The Prime Minister would get no gratitude for doing what they considered to be his duty as Leader of the House. The right hon. Gentleman had taken away all their privileges and he expected gratitude because he might offer a few more days. The right hon. Gentleman would not get it. The hon. Gentleman who had just spoken refrained from discussing the only test as to whether he was doing his duty; and that was whether the days allotted were enough. The Prime Minister refrained from saying anything on that point. In these allotted days, six new clauses put down by the Government, and twenty other new clauses, eleven of which were put down by supporters of the Government, would have to be discussed. The hon. Gentleman did not appear to know that. He had not even attended the debate, because he himself had stated the fact previously. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University was the only Member on the other side who had taken a right attitude on this question. But he did not put the case against the Government as strongly as it could have been put. The right hon. Gentleman said that the Amendments to Clause 2 could not be completed; but Clause 3 was also to be taken on the same day; and, therefore, Clause 3 could not be discussed at all, although it contained the financial clauses. They were getting tired of the moderate speeches which were being delivered on the other side. There should be a little mutiny. It was no use asking for days. Why not sit to the end of August, or else resume in September or October. Personally, he derived very little comfort from what had been said by his right hon. friend the Member for the Berwick Division. If they allowed the Government of the day with its sheep-like, servile majority, to act in this way, the next Liberal Government would have nothing to do but to repeal statutes. That was a very serious situation. It would not suffice to have to undo the wrongs of the present Government. Another matter was that the Liberal Party did not know whether it would or would not be supported by the Irish Members. If the Liberals tried to repeal this Bill, they would not be supported by the Irish Members. Considerations such as that ought to be taken into account when they were discussing the period of time to be allowed. Every hon. Member who had the right spirit should demand from the Prime Minister an adequate extension of time.

Sir J. FERGUSSON (Manchester, N.E.) said he thought that opinion outside the House would be that instead of discussing the number of days to be allotted, they had better get on with the business and not have speeches delivered over and over again. Thirty years ago, having returned from foreign service, he was told by a leading Member of the Party opposite that they would have to do away with the twelve o'clock rule if they wanted to get business through.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! The question before the House is whether the number of days should be six or eighteen.

Sir J. FERGUSSON said he would only say in conclusion that if they were to get to business, in his opinion six days were quite sufficient to discuss this Bill.

Mr. RENWICK (Newcastle-on-Tyne) said he had no hesitation in saying that six days were ample for the discussion of this Bill. Hon. Members opposite did not think so, but he thought he could suggest a means whereby six days would be found adequate and that was by all lawyers keeping quiet during the debate on the Bill, leaving the discussion to business men. Business men would then acknowledge that six days were long enough. One of the Members of the Opposition twitted some of the supporters of the Government with having gone to Ascot. But all of them did not deserve that taunt. He did not go to Ascot. [Loud ironical cheers.] The fact that he did not go to Ascot deserved no cheering. Instead of going to Ascot he remained in the House and attended to his duties. What was more, he entered the House yesterday morning at 11.30 and did not leave it until 12.30 that morning. Thirteen hours he remained in the House listening to speeches, and at the end of it no business had been done. The House was suffering from a plethora of speeches. [Ironical cheers.] It might be that that ironical cheer arose because it was thought he intervened often in debate, but he had never said a word in regard to the Licensing Bill. He spoke very rarely in the House and whenever he did he never exceeded fifteen minutes. He ventured to say, as a business man, that if the business of the House were conducted on business lines, and the speeches restricted to fifteen or twenty minutes, six days would be ample to deal with the Bill in Committee and on Report.

SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) protested against the hon. Member's doctrine that no lawyers should take part in this debate. The only Government speeches that were of value in this Bill, when they were allowed to discuss it, were those of the hon. and learned Solicitor-General, who all, friend and foe alike, would admit had conducted this Bill so far as it had been left in his charge with great mastery of detail and great courtesy. The hon. Member for Stowmarket and other hon. Members who had spoken seemed to think that the whole object of the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman was to obtain a reasonable discussion on the Bill. The scheme of the right hon. Gentleman on the contrary made a reasonable discussion of the vital portions of this Bill an impossibility, as was seen if they took the example of Clauses 2 and 3 which were grouped together all through the Bill. Those were the clauses dealing with that important question compensation. The end of Clause 2 dealt with the question of who was to get compensation, and the beginning of Clause dealt with the question of who was to pay it, and the Resolution of the right hon. Gentleman made it impossible to discuss these vital questions, and one reason why an extension of time was asked for was to enable Clause 3 to have a day to itself.

MR. THEODORE TAYLOR (Lancashire, Radcliffe) contended it would be absolutely impossible to discuss the Bill within the time suggested by the Prime Minister. They had the same experience two years ago on the Education Bill, the result being that that Act was unworkable and required amendment. He ventured to say there never was a greater exhibition of the impotence of Parliament to do its work than what was then going on. He had described to his children that the House of Commons was engaged in talking about what they should talk about. It only showed the absolute necessity, if Parliament was to regain control of its business, of having some means of ascertaining the general sense of the House. If there was necessity for closure by compartments there could be smaller compartments than those proposed by the Prime Minister. It was said that many Members of the Opposition were opposed to the main provisions of this Bill, but that was no legitimate reason why the Opposition should be closured. If that were legitimate it would be a reason for closuring all contentious Bills. If they were to pass good practical legislation they would have to find out the general feeling of the House, and, to do that Bills must be properly discussed. To have no better means of carrying on its business than the system of closuring proposed by the Government reflected upon the intelligence of the House of Commons.

* MR. TOMKINSON (Cheshire, Crewe) while admitting that it was the hope of the Opposition that this Bill might yet be defeated, absolutely denied that they were

averse to any amendment of the measure. There were innumerable provisions which required the closest investigation, such for instance as the manner in which the compensation should be decided, and the procedure to be adopted when the whole of the licences were in the hands of one owner; and Amendments were necessary to make the Bill less objectionable. The absolute refusal of the Prime Minister to extend the allotted time justified the suspicion that there were causes for this Resolution which did not appear on the surface. The truth was that the Government were afraid of a full discussion of the Bill; they shrank from a thorough investigation of details, and the Opposition would fail in their duty if they did not make every possible protest against the manner in which the Bill had been brought forward, and the means by which it was being forced through against the manifest will of the country.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 260; Noes, 202. (Division List No. 191.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Lt.-Col. H. F (Middlesex)
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A (Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A (Worc.
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Rt. Hon. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Dewar, Sir T. R. (Tower Hamlets
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theordore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'derry
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R. (Dulwich)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley)
Heath, James (Staffords. N. W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop)
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks. N R
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants. Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.

M‘Iver,SirLewis(Edinburgh,W
M‘Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell, William (Burnley)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moore, William
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Peel, Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, S.Forde(Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt.Hn.Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robinson, Brooke
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel,Sir HarryS.(Limehouse
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Smith,H.C(North'mb.Tyneside
Smith, James Parker(Lanarks.)
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur(Ormskirk)
Stanley, Edward Jas.(Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord(Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M‘Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G(Oxf'dUniv.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Sir Charles G.E.(Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H.(Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay(Galway)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans, Sir Fran.H. (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Field, William
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hain, Edward
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt,Lewis V.(Rossendale)
Harcourt,RtHnSir W(Monm'th
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol,E.)
Hobhouse,RtHn H(Somers't,E
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy,Vincent P.(Cavan,W.
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis

Leamy, Edmund
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (Accrington)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M‘Crae, George
M‘Fadden, Edward
M‘Hugh, Patrick A.
M‘Kean, John
M‘Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Middlemore, Jn. Throgmorton
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh,N.)
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow,W.
O'Doherty, William
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Reid, Sir R. Threshie(Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Rose, Charles Day
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomas,J.A.(Gl'morgan,Gower
Tillet, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton, J. Lawson (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Fred. W.(Norfolk,Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Woodhouse,Sir J.T(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M‘Arthur.

Main Question again proposed.

Mr. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided:—Ayes, 265; Noes, 201. (Division List No. 192.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Allhusen,Augustus HenryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster,Rt.Hn.Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey,Fletcher,Rt.Hon.SirH.
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt.Hon. A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T.(Windsor)
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beach,Rt.Hn.Sir MichaelHicks
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Lt.-Col.H.F(Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt.Hn.J.A.(Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain,Rt Hn.J.A(Worc.
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Rt.Hn. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig,Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.
Cross, HerbertShepherd(Bolton
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies,Sir HoratioD.(Chatham
Dewar,Sir T.R.(Tower Hamlets
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland,Sir FredDixon
Dorington, Rt.Hn. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt.Hn.Sir William Hart

Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants.,W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson,Rt.Hn.Sir J.(Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn. J.E.(Elgin&Nairn)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton,Marq of(L'nd'nderry
Hardy,Laurence (Kent,Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R.(Dulwich)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford,W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, Jn.(Kent, Faversham
Howard, J. (Midd.,Tottenham)
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kennaway, Rt.Hn.Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.(Salop.
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks., N.R
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col.CharlesW.(Evesham)
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Iver,Sir Lewis(Edinburgh,W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Middlemore, Jn. Throgmorton
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Moore, William
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Peel, Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, S.Forde(Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt.Hn.Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robinson, Brooke
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel,Sir HarryS.(Limehouse
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Saunderson, Rt.Hn.Col.Edw.J.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Smith,H. C. (Nort'mb.Tyneside
Smith, James Parker(Lanarks.)
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas,(Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord(Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G(Oxf'dUniv.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Sir Charles G.E.(Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H.(Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley,Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Bowles, T.Gibson(King's Lynn
Brigg, John

Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Channing, Francis Allston
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay(Galway)
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Fran. H. (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. S. Munro (Leith)
Field, William
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hn. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hain, Edward
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale)
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. Sir W(Monm'h
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leamy, Edmund
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Chas. Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh, N.)
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy John
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan Joseph (Louth, South)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Doherty, William
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Rose, Charles Day
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, JA (Glamorgan, Gower
Tillet, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson Chas. Henry (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York. W.R.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and
Mr. William M'Arthur.

Question put accordingly.

As the House was being cleared for the division,

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich) seated, said; I do not want to seem unruly, Sir, or disobedient to the rules of the House. I feel that the best thing I can do is to ask you to suspend me from the service of the House. If I am to be closured in this manner without an opportunity of speaking, I think it would be better if it were done forthwith. I shall be rejoiced to be relieved of the responsibility of marching through the Lobby and doing nothing at all.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is asking me to do what I have no power to do. I cannot suspend him. It is for the House to suspend him if he does what I hope he will not do, and that is to show disrespect to the rules of the House. The hon. Member has made his protest openly, and no doubt notice will be taken of the fact; and if he goes through the Lobby he will make his protest in a legitimate and proper way.

Mr. CROOKS: I agree, Mr. Speaker, that is the proper way. But what can one do when we are closured down? I want to be respectful to you and to the House, but this is the only way in which one has a chance of bringing before the public the iniquitous act of the Government over this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the hon. Member will see that what he is doing is really not in the nature of a protest; it is merely acting obstructively to the House.

The House divided; Ayes, 262; Noes, 207. (Division List No. 193.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beach, Rt. Hn Sir Michael Hicks
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charies
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Lt.-Col. H. F. (Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc.)
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Rt. Hn. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Dewar, Sir T. R. (Tower Hamlets
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick. S. W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'donderry
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R. (Dulwich)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords., N, W,)
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside)
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney. Col. W. (Salop.
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks. N. R.
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants. Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.

Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W.
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.
Moore, William
Morgan, David J. (Walthamst'w
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robinson, Brooke
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir H. S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas (Somerset)
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood
and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Channing, Francis Allston
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Field, William
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hn. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hain, Edward
Haldane, R. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Rt Hn. Sir W. (Monm't
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)

Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P.(Cavan,W
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex.(Donegal,W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leamy, Edmund
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M‘Crae, George
M‘Fadden, Edward
M‘Hugh, Patrick A.
M‘Kean, John
M‘Kenna, Reginald
M‘Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh, N.)
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Doherty, William
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrot, William
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, Davin
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, H. C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theordore C. (Radcliffe
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Tillet, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Charles Henry (Hull, W.
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Hudd's'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and
Mr. William M‘Arthur

Ordered, That the proceedings in Committee and on Report of the Licensing Bill shall be brought to a conclusion in the manner hereinafter mentioned on six allotted days.

(a) The proceedings in Committee on Clause 1 on the first allotted day.

(b) The proceedings in Committee on Clauses 2 and 3 on the second allotted day.

(c) The proceedings in Committee on Clause 4 on the third allotted day.

(d) The proceedings in Committee on the remaining clauses of the Bill, and on any new Government clauses, and on schedules and any new Government schedules, and any other proceedings necessary to bring the Committee stage to a conclusion on the fourth allotted day.

(e) The proceedings on Report on any new clauses and on Amendments to Clauses 1, 2, and 3, of that Bill, be brought to a conclusion on the fifth allotted day; and

(f) The proceedings on Report be concluded on the sixth allotted day.

After this Order comes into operation, any day shall be considered an allotted day for the purposes of this Order on which the Licensing Bill is put down as the first Order of the Day.

At 11 p.m. on the said allotted days, or if the day is a Friday at 4.30 p.m., the Chairman or Speaker shall put forthwith the Question or Questions on any Amendment or Motion already proposed from the Chair, and shall next proceed successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments moved by the Government of which notice has been given (but no other Amendments) and on every Question necessary to dispose of the allotted business to be concluded on the allotted day.

In the case of Government Amendments, or of Government new clauses or schedules, he shall put only the Question that the Amendment be made, or that the clause or schedule be added to the the Bill, as the case may be.

At 12 midnight on the day on which the Third Reading of the Bill is put down as first Order, or if that day is a Friday, at 5.30 p.m., the Speaker shall put forthwith any Question necessary to conclude the proceedings on that stage of the Bill.

Proceedings to which this Order relates shall not be interrupted (except at an Afternoon Sitting at 7.30. p.m.) under the provisions of any Standing Order relating to Sittings of the House.

After the passing of this Order, on any day on which any proceedings on the Licensing Bill stand as the first Order of the Day, no dilatory Motion on the Bill, nor under Standing Order No. 10, nor Motion to postpone a clause, shall be received unless moved by the Minister in charge of the Bill, and the Question on any such Motion shall be put forthwith. Nor shall any opposed Private Business be set down at the Evening Sitting for consideration on any of the allotted days or on the day on which the Third Reading of the Bill is put down as first Order.

If Progress be reported, the Chairman shall put this Order in force in any subsequent sitting of the Committee.

EVENING SITTING.

LICENSING BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. Lowther (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 1 :—

*Mr. HELME (Lancashire, Lancaster) said the word he asked the Committee to insert after the word unsuitable would make it perfectly clear in the future that the magistrates could exercise their discretion in the matter of the renewal of licences quite apart from the structure itself. Under the unusual circumstances in which the Committee at present found itself by the closure Motion just adopted he gathered that it was not the wish of the Government that he should occupy the time of the Committee by giving his reasons for moving this Amendment and he therefore asked the Committee to accept it on the ground that its meaning was manifest, and its object was good and it was of the very greatest practical importance. If the Government would not have discussion he would throw on them the responsibility of recording their votes to destroy the effective control of the justices if that was their desire. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 7, after the word 'unsuitable,' to insert the word 'otherwise."—(*Mr. Helme.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'otherwise' be there inserted."

Mr. H. C. RICHARDS (Finsbury, E.), who was continually interrupted by cries of "Divide," said the Committee was being treated with scant courtesy by his hon. friend who, speaking as a magistrate, had moved this Amendment without giving the House his reasons for so doing. He, as a lawyer, wanted to know what it was the hon. Member was asking the Committee to do. He thought the Committee had already settled this principle. There had been three days discussion upon it, and he thought it was quite clear that, while they had no intention of giving unsuitable tenants and tenants of unsuitable premises a fresh lease of life, there was no intention to inflict on the present licence-holders a new disqualification. If this Amendment was carried it would be extremely difficult for the various benches of magistrates to know what the alteration in the law was if the words "otherwise unsuitable" were put into the Bill. A bench of magistrates for any reason or lack of reason, for personal pique because they did not like the man, would be able to dispossess him without compensation. How unfair that would be after what had been said with regard to the ante-1869 licences that, although the houses were in most cases unsuitable, the holders of those licences should have compensation. If this Amendment were carried there was a chance of their losing their licences without compensation. The question had been raised as to the house being unsuitable because it was next to a chapel, church or school, but if that house was carrying on its business in accordance with the existing law it could not be said it was unsuitable because of its position in a neighbourhood which in all probability had grown up around it. Another thing they had to consider was that premises which might have been suitable fifty or sixty years ago might not in the altered circumstances of to-day be regarded as suitable, and it would be a monstrous thing if the old licences were taken away without any reason and without any compensation. He appealed to the Government not to accept the Amendment.

SIR ROBERT REID (Dumfries Burghs), in supporting the Amendment, said they were fighting this Bill, with a very strong feeling against it, under very exceptional conditions. All this Amendment meant was that the local justices were to keep in their own hands the discretion of renewals or non-renewals on the ground of structural deficiencies or of premises unsuitable otherwise, as the Bill stood the word "unsuitable" was governed by the word "structural." This should not be so, it ought to be unsuitability of any legal kind. Was it fair to attenuate the small space of time at their disposal either by the absence of Gentlemen who might be present or by speaking against time for the purpose of preventing other Amendments from being considered? He appealed to every right-minded man not to act in that way.

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL (Sir EDWARD CARSON, Dublin University) did not think there was any occasion for the outburst of his hon. and learned friend. There had been only one speech from the Unionist side of the House, and he did not suppose his hon. and learned friend would go so far as to say that not a word was to be said from that side of the House. He did not know how he was to treat this as a serious Amendment when the hon Member who introduced it said he did not think it necessary to give any reasons in support of it. He could not accept the Amendment because by so doing he would take away the whole foundation of the argument with which he successfully resisted the Amendment to leave out the word "unsuitable," which the hon. and learned Member for Shrewsbury moved on a previous occasion. To put in this word "otherwise" would be to leave it open to the magistrates, through no default whatever on the part of the licence-holder, to confiscate the licence and the compensation for which he had subscribed. Suppose that a church or school were built near an old-established licensed house, and the magistrates came to the conclusion that, owing to such proximity, that was no longer a suitable place for the licensed house, what default was there on the part of the licence-holder? The truth was this Amendment, small as it might seem, would strike at the foundation of the Bill; for the whole principle upon which the Bill had been framed was that of allowing people to insure their premises if those premises were to be taken for the public benefit. It had been assumed that because a man got compensation, therefore he would be anxious to have his licence taken away. No such thing would follow at all. In many cases the compensation might not be anything like as much as was made out of the premises; and there was also an additional hold over a man who had a licence of this kind, for if he did not keep the premises in a condition of which the magistrates approved he might be put into one of the categories under the Bill which would deprive him of compensation altogether. Surely a man who knew that in order to get compensa- everything depended on the way in which he conducted the premises was far more likely to strive to carry out the wishes of the magistrates than a man who practically lost nothing when his premises were taken away. Under the circumstances they could not possibly accept the Amendment.

*MR. H. D. GREENE (Shrewsbury) said he was glad to hear that the Government did not intend to accept this Amendment. At the same time he thought there was abundant justification for the Amendment being moved. There was an ambiguity in the language of the

Bill in respect to this matter which the Government ought to clear up. This Clause was framed to provide a very pretty law suit for the benefit, no doubt, of a very deserving class. It would be far better for the Solicitor-General to deal with the matter now. As to whether the word "structural" governed the word "unsuitable" the Solicitor-General interpreted the clause one way and another hon. Member on his side of the House interpreted it another. The same diversity of opinion existed on the other side. As it stood the question must be raised either on a case stated for the High Court or at quarter sessions. He held that the word structurally ought to be inserted.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 125; Noes, 177. (Division List No. 194.)

AYES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Black, Alexander William
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Channing, Francis Allston
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Edwards, Frank
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W.
Kilbride, Denis
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lundon, W.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh, N.)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Newnes, Sir George
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Doherty, William
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Perks, Robert William
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries)
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roche, John
Russell, T. W.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Helme and Mr. Trevelyan.

NOES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Austin, Sir John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bowles, Lt.-Col. H. F. (Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen

Mr. H. D. Greene.

Bull, William James
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish,V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain,Rt.Hn.J.A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Crean, Eugene
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Davies,Sir HoratioD.(Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale,Rt.Hon.Sir JosehhC.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke,Rt.Hon.Sir William Hart
Fardell, Sir T. George
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fitzroy,Hon.Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Forster, Henry William
Foster,Philip S.(Warwick,S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, Hn.J.E.(Elgin & Nairn
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Hamilton,Marq. of (L'donderry
Hardy,Laurence(Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton(Tynem'th)
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R (Dulwich)
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford,W.)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hobhouse,RtHn.H.(Somers'tE
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hozier, Hon.James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop)
Kerr, John
Kimber, Henry
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson,JohnGrant(Yorks.N.R
Lee,Arthur H.(Hants.Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter (Bristol,S.)
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Iver,SirLewis(Edinburgh,W.
Majendie, James A. H.
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell,W.J.H.(Dumfriesshire
Milvain, Thomas
Moore, William
Morgan,DavidJ.(Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray,Rt.Hn.A.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Peel,Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, S.Forde (Bethnal Green
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Rt.Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stock, James Henry
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby,Lt.-Col.A.C.E.(Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G.E. (Notts.
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H.(Yorks.)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

MR. J. H. LEWIS (Flint Boroughs) moved an Amendment with the object of preserving the administrative discretion of the magistrates in order that they might continue to bring pressure to bear to prevent frequent changes of tenancy. The constant transfer of licences, particularly in the case of tied houses, constituted, he said, one of the scandals of the licensing system. It had been calculated that no fewer than 20,000 transfers were effected per annum. In Hertfordshire 423 houses changed hands more than three times during five years; in Hull there were nearly 400 transfers a year; in Lincoln the average tenancy of tied houses was two and a half years; in Leeds out of 379 tied houses there were 165 transfers in one year, and in Birmingham out of 2,300 licences there were 800 transfers per annum. In a large number of these cases tenant after tenant was ruined owing to the exorbitant terms imposed by the brewers, and it was desirable that the magistrates should be able to bring pressure to prevent these constant changes from taking place. He submitted that in these cases the words "ill-conducted" did not cover the ground.

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 1, line 7, after the word "unsuitable," to insert the words "or have been subject to frequent changes of tenancy.'"—(*Mr. J. H. Lewis.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS (Kent, St. Augustine's) pointed out that if changes of tenancy were due to ill-conduct the magistrates already had power to take away the licence without compensation. But if the changes were due to mortality, illness, or any other circumstances, then, if the licence was taken away, compensation ought to follow. There might be evils connected with constant changes of tenancy, but, on the other hand, anything that tended to prevent a brewer from sending away a bad tenant ought not to be encouraged. The Government could not accept the Amendment.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 123; Noes, 194. (Division List No. 195.)

AYES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Black, Alexander William
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Channing, Francis Allston
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cremer, William Randall
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones,David Brynmor(Swansea
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy,Vincent P.(Cavan,W.
Kilbride, Denis
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lloyd-George, David
Lundon, W.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mitchell, Edw.(Fermanagh, N.)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Newnes, Sir George
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary Mid
O'Connor,James(Wicklow W.)
O'Doherty, William
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Perks, Robert William
Power, Patrick Joseph
Reid, Sir R.Threshie(Dumfries)
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roche, John
Russell, T. W.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas,David Alfred(Merthyr)
Thomas,JA (Glamorgan, Gower
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason,JohnCathcart (Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson,Fred.W.(Norfolk,Mid.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Herbert Lewis and Mr. Robert Wallace.

NOES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen,Augustus HenryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster,Rt.Hn.Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hn.SirH.
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt.Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord

Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Lt.-Col H. F. (Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, William James
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, RtHn. J. A. Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Crean, Eugene
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Fardell, Sir T. George
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Gore, Hn. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'donderry
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R. (Dulwich)
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley)
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hobhouse, RtHn. H. (Somers't, E
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham)
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred.
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Kerr, John
Kimber, Henry
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks. N.R.)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants. Fareham)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh, W.
Majendie, James A. H.
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriesshire
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Milvain, Thomas
Moore, William
Morgan, David J. (Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stock, James Henry
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts)
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks.)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.) moved a drafting Amendment to make it perfectly clear that one ground with regard to unfitness would be sufficient to enable the magistrates or local justices to exercise their full discretion.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 7, after the third word 'or' to insert the words 'on any ground or.'"—(*Mr. Herbert Roberts.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*MR. AKERS DOUGLAS said there was no necessity for the Amendment, because according to Section 1 of the Interpretation Act, 1889, the singular included the plural, and the plural the singular.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS moved an Amendment to the first sub-section giving power to the justices of the licensing district, in considering the question of the renewal of any licence, to take into account not only the character or fitness of the incoming tenant, or proposed holder of the licence, but the character or fitness of the outgoing tenant. The discretion of the justices in such a case was, as the Bill stood, limited to the point whether or not the premises had been "ill-conducted." He thought his point might best be put by stating an imaginary concrete case. Supposing the outgoing tenant was either a poacher himself in a country district or was known to have received poachers upon his licensed premises. It might be held in considering the renewal of the licence in such a case that the local justices had no right to consider the question of the fitness of the character of the outgoing licensee. As the section was drawn at present it was doubtful whether the local justices could exercise a full discretion in reference to that case. With regard to the Amendment referring to reasonable refreshment, he acknowledged that the section withdrew a certain power of pressure under this Bill. It was in order to safeguard the full discretion of the local justices that he moved this Amendment. The hon. Member opposite had said that there was so much vagueness in this Bill that it was impossible to tell what it meant, and that state of things made it all the more necessary with regard to the renewal of licences that every care should be taken to make it perfectly clear that the justices had precisely the same powers of discretion as they had now. The Solicitor-General said there had been many fallacies as to the effect of this clause upon the discretion of the local justices. He did not suppose that anybody would contend that this section would give to the justices any discretionary power with regard to the conduct and character of the outgoing tenants. It was of the utmost importance that it should be made plain that the local justices retained their full powers of discretion, and he begged to move his Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 8, after the word 'character,' to insert the words 'or conduct of the actual holder of the licence.'"—(*Mr. Herbert Roberts.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS said the hon. Member was dealing with the case of the outgoing tenant, but what they were more deeply interested in was the incoming tenant, because, so far as the outgoing tenant was concerned, his case could be dealt with under the words in the Bill as to the ill-conduct of the premises. If this Amendment were accepted he was afraid it would put it into the power of a tenant wilfully to misbehave himself in order that those interested in the licensed premises should not be able to obtain compensation. The conduct of the outgoing tenant was so far as necessary dealt with by the earlier words of the clause, and they could not accept the Amendment.

MR. BROADHURST (Leicester) said the objection of the Home Secretary was an imaginary one, and was, to say the least of it, far-fetched. This Amendment dealt with the class of tenants engaged at very short notice to quit, and they would have very little opportunity of entering into a conspiracy to damage the property of the brewers by doing something to injure the house in order to prevent full compensation being given. His experience was, that if [they had a bad tenant with a bad record he was generally succeeded by a person with a similar character, because the house got a bad name, and no man with money to lose could be found to become the tenant of a house with a reputation of this kind. His hon. friend's Amendment dealt with a very important point, and one which was well worthy of the consideration of the Committee, and well worth inserting in the Bill. He remembered one case in which a tenant came before the court with a pile of recommendations, nearly all from clergymen in the Church of England, and they appalled the court, and they had to accept the applicant. The man had been recently accused of horse-stealing, and he suspected something of the kind when he saw such a long list of recommendations from members of the Church of England. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh."] He was saying this without prejudice. The ministers in his Church and Free Churches generally did not write characters for men going as tenants into public-houses. In this particular case the result was that for three or four succeeding tenancies no one conducted that house upon satisfactory principles. One man who attempted to carry on the business in a highly respectable manner became bankrupt, and was kicked out by the brewers after a very few days notice. He thought this Amendment was one which would commend itself to all hon. Members who had had any lengthy experience at brewster sessions, examining into the character of the men who came into those houses, and who often went out of them hastily. It was an Amendment of considerable importance, and could not be disposed of by the reasons given by the Home Secretary.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 132; Noes, 226. (Division List No. 196.)

AYES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Asquith,Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Black, Alexander William
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Burke, E. Haviland
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Channing, Francis Allston
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Delany, William
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Gladstone, Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol,E.)
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy,Vincent P.(Cavan,W.
Kilbride, Denis
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal,W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh,N.)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Newnes, Sir George
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Doherty, William
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Perks, Robert William
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Reid, Sir R. Threshie(Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roche, John
Russell, T. W.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen,E.)
Thomas, Sir A.(Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomas,J A(Glamorgan,Gower
Tillet, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Jn. Lawson(Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Fred. W.(Norfolk,Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Woodhouse,Sir J.T(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Herbert Roberts and Mr. Broadhurst.

NOES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Bowles, Lt.-Col. H. A (Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A (Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Crean, Eugene
Cross, Herbert Shepherd (Bolton
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Doogan, P. C.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fardell, Sir T. George
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nderry
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R. (Dulwich)
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hobhouse, Rt Hn H (Somers't, E
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, Jn. (Kent, Faversham)
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Saney, Col. W. (Salop.
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks., N.R.
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh, W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.)
Milvain, Thomas
Moore, William
Morgan, David J. (Walthamst'w
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Dowd, John
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunton

Welby, Sir Charles G.E.(Notts.)
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H.(Yorks.)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

MR. LAWRENCE (Liverpool, Abercromby) said he desired to move the Amendment standing in his name on the Paper. The point he wished to raise was whether this clause did or did not limit the discretion of the magistrates. He held the opinion that under the words "ill-conducted" the discretion of the magistrates was unduly limited. He therefore suggested that after the word "character" the words "conduct of his business by" should be inserted. The question was whether the word "ill-conducted" modified the power of the magistrate in seeing that a business was properly carried on. The best way would be to show by concrete instances how the discretion of the magistrates hitherto had operated. In Liverpool, under the present system, they had put down the long pull, and forbidden the offering of sweets to children who were sent to public-houses. Neither of those things could be described as ill-conduct, and they were no more illegitimate than the conduct of shipping companies in carrying people across the Atlantic below cost price. He wished to know, if this Bill was passed, how the magistrates would stand with regard to customs which, although they were undesirable in themselves, were not strictly illegitimate. He had suggested these words because he thought it would enlarge the powers of the Bill, and leave the magistrates somewhat freer. He quite recognised that the magistrates had not always shown the proper discretion, and that they had now and then tried to impose limitations which were to be deprecated. In some cases they had almost attempted to legislate instead of merely administering the law. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 8, after the word 'character,' to insert the words 'conduct of his business by.'"—(*Mr. Lawrence.*)

Question proposed "That those words be there inserted."

SIR EDWARD CARSON said the Government could not possibly accept the Amendment. It referred not merely to the particular business with which the magistrates were dealing, but to any business in which the applicant was previously concerned. Anything that was to be gained by the Amendment was already provided for in the Bill. If the Amendment referred only to the fitness of a person to hold a licence that was already in the Bill. He ventured to say that the interests of the public were sufficiently protected by the clause as it now stood. On the other hand, if the proposed words were inserted they might leave it open to an extreme bench of justices to judge a man, not on his own merits, or in relation to the premises in which he actually conducted the business, but in relation to something else.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 150; Noes, 228. (Division List No. 197.)

AYES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Channing, Francis Allston
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Delany, William
Denny, Colonel
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank

Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmot, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Horniman, Frederick John
Houston, Robert Paterson
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones,DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M‘Arthur, Charles (Liverpool
M‘Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M‘Crae, George
M‘Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Middlemore,John Throgmorton
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh, N.)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Newnes, Sir George
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary,Mid
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Malley, William
Parrott, William
Perks, Robert William
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Rose, Charles Day
Russell, T. W.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Spear, John Ward
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas,David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, JA(Glamorgan,Gower
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson(Leeds,S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, Fred. W.(Norfolk,Mid.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Woodhouse,SirJT.(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. W. F. Lawrence and Mr. Osmond Williams.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen,Augustus HenryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster,Rt.Hn.Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hn. Sir H.
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour,Rt. Hn. A.J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour,RtHnGerald W.(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R.(Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beach,Rt.Hn.SirMichael Hicks
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Lt. Col. H.F (Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish,V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain,Rt.HnJ.A.(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim,S.
Crean, Eugene
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb, Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies,Sir HoratioD.(Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale, Rt.Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Forster, Henry William
Foster,Philip S.(Warwick,S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, Hn J.E. (Elgin&Nairn)
Gore, Hn. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton,Marq.of (L'nd'nderry
Hardy,Laurence (Kent,Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)

Harris, Dr. Fredk. R. (Dulwich)
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford W.)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hobhouse,RtHnH,(Somers't,E
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F. (Sheffield,Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Howard John(Kent,Faversham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt.Hon. Arthur Fred.
Kenyon,Hon.Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson JohnGrant(Yorks.N.R
LeeArthurH.(Hants.,Fareham)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col.CharlesW.(Evesham)
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter (Bristol,S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Iver,Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell,W.J.H.(Dumfriesshire
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, Hon.J.Scott (Hants.)
Moore, William
Morgan,DavidJ.(Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray,RtHn.A.Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Doherty, William
O'Dowd, John
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Peel,Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley,S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith,James Parker (Lanarks.)
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley,Hon.Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley,Edward Jas.(Somerset)
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'd Univ.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.Col.A.C.E. (Taunton
Welby,Sir Charles G.E.(Notts.)
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson,A. Stanley(York, E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd,Sir W.H.(Yorks.)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Young, Samuel
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS had given notice of an Amendment to insert in Clause 1, line 8, after "fitness" the words "or *status* as regards the licensed premises."

*THE CHAIRMAN: I believe this Amendment really raises the same question as the Amendment proposed by the hon. Member for West Denbighshire and recently discussed.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS: It raises the question of *status*.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I suppose that means *bona fide* tenancy.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS: The object of the Amendment is to ensure that the local justices shall have under this section the same rights which they now enjoy under Section 16, Sub-section 1, of the Licensing Act, 1902, to ask for the perusal of agreements between a brewery company and a landlord.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The object is to see whether a man is a *bona fide* tenant or not. [Opposition cries of "No."] I do not know what the object is unless it is to find out whether it is a *bona fide* tenancy.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS: It is to see under what conditions he carries on the tenancy.

***The CHAIRMAN**: Surely the conditions of the tenancy are to show whether the tenancy is *bona fide*. [Opposition cries of "No."] What else does it show? I think it really raises the same point.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS: May I move the Amendment in order to ask a question of the Government, namely, whether this clause will enable the justices to ask for the perusal of any agreement there is between the landlord or a brewery company and the licence-holder? It is a question of great administrative importance, as I know from long experience on the Bench.

***The CHAIRMAN**: I really cannot see that this raises any question except that of the *bona fides* of the tenant. The fact that the licence-holder has some agreement of the kind indicated by the hon. Member would only make the premises come under the name of a tied house. [Opposition cries of "No."] Well, I cannot conceive any other, and the hon. Member has not suggested any other.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS: I will suggest it at once. It is a question of the length of the tenancy.

***The CHAIRMAN**: The point the hon. Member has mentioned has already been discussed. We have had Amendments dealing with the length of the tenancy.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: Supposing there is a condition in connection with the tenancy which affects the proportion of the contribution, that has nothing to do with a tied house at all. It may be between an ordinary landlord and an ordinary tenant. That has nothing whatever to do with the length of the tenancy or with the purchasing of goods from certain people. The only point which my hon. friend wishes to raise is whether the magistrates shall have the right to see the agreement and consider these points before they arrive at a decision. We have not discussed the point at all.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): Supposing the agreement contracts the tenant out of the rights to be conferred on him by this Bill, what would be the position of the tenant?

***The CHAIRMAN**: Then he is not a *bona fide* tenant. That is a question which has already been discussed.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: I beg your pardon.

***The CHAIRMAN**: If the hon. Member will bring forward an Amendment raising the specific point he has put, I will consider it, but the word "*status*" covers *bona fides*, and it covers the position of a tenant as regards a tied house. Both of these points have already been discussed.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: The magistrates have a right to know what the *status* of a tenant really is with regard to this question.

*MR. EMMOTT said there was a recent case in which the licence-holder gave a power of attorney to a brewery company. It was most important that the magistrates should have power to get information in cases of that kind. It worked out in this way. At any moment the brewery company could step in and use the power of attorney and turn the man out without compensation of any kind.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Gentleman may move the Amendment if he will undertake not to raise the tied house question. I do not know whether the word "*status*" is known to English law. It is a Latin word which may cover a good deal.

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): I would suggest to my hon. friend that instead of the words in the Amendment he should move the insertion of the words "or contracted rights or liabilities as regards the licensed premises."

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS said he would move the Amendment in the way suggested by the right hon. Gentleman. His only wish was to obtain the view of the Government as to whether under this section local justices would have the same power of examining documents as they now possessed.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 8, after the word 'fitness,' to insert the words 'or contracted rights or liabilities as regards the licensed premises.'"—(*Mr. Herbert Roberts.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR EDWARD CARSON said the mover of the Amendment had asked whether under this clause the magistrates would continue to have the powers which were vested in them by the Licensing Act of 1892 as to calling for certain documents. There was nothing in this Bill to take away these powers from the local licensing justices. It was quite plain that the procedure before the local licensing justices would be exactly the same as at present.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Can they refuse the licence if they consider the conditions unfair?

SIR EDWARD CARSON: They have the same power of calling on parties to produce agreements.

SIR ROBERT REID said the magistrates might call for the production of documents, but when they had got them, they could do nothing. The virtue of the Amendment was that it enabled them not merely to call for the documents, but, if they were unsatisfactory, to act on the documents by refusing the renewal of the licence if necessary. It was perfectly idle for the Solicitor-General to say that if the words of the Amendment were not inserted the powers of the justices would be the same as at present.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 151; Noes, 251. (Division List, No. 198.)

AYES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Channing, Francis Allston
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Delany, William
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hn. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale
Harwood, George
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Horniman, Frederick John
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W.
Kitson, Sir James
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lundon, W.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markam, Arthur Basil
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh, N.)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Newnes, Sir George
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Perks, Robert William
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Tillet, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.)
Wilson, Henry J (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Huddersf'd

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Herbert Roberts and Mr. Lough.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H.
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur

Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Lt.-Col. H.F(Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W.(Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A.(Worc
Chaplain, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Colston, Chas Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig, Charles Curtis(Antrim, S.
Crean, Eugene
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Doogan, P. C.
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Midd'x
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R. (Dulwich)
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords. N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Rt Hn H. (Somers't, E
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, John (Kent, Faversham
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks. N.R
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants. Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hon. W. F.
Maxwell, W. J. H (Dumfriesshire
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.)
Moore, William
Morgan, David J. (Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Doherty, William
O'Dowd, John
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Col. William George
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)

Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks.)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Young, Samuel
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood
and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

MR. WHITLEY said he wished to move the omission of the word "proposed," so as to keep within the purview of the magistrates not only the character or fitness of the "proposed holder of the licence," but the continued methods in which the particular house had been conducted. If the word "proposed" were retained in the clause, it appeared to him that it would be possible for any offence against the licensing laws to be absolutely wiped out by bringing forward a new tenant. As a matter of fact that was a practice not unknown in some districts. Some owners of licensed premises were so keen to get a maximum of profits that they had a system of bringing in a succession of licence-holders, and winking at malpractices of the tenant until he was dropped upon by the police. He could not think that it was the object of the Government to encourage a practice of that kind, but unless the word "proposed" was left out, the magistrates would have no control whatever over the licence-holder.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 8, to leave out the word, 'proposed.'"—(*Mr. Whitley.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'proposed' stand part of the clause."

SIR EDWARD CARSON said that the Amendment would make the Bill utterly unworkable. It would compel the magistrates to inquire, not into the character or fitness of the man who was going to carry on the business but of the man who had been put out, probably because he did not carry it on properly. He hoped the House would not agree to the Amendment.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 245; Noes, 151. (Division List No. 199.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. J. A. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Lt. Col. H. F. (Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.
Crean, Eugene
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Doogan, P. C.
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore

Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Gore, Hn. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R. (Dulwich)
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords. N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Rt Hn H. (Somers't, E
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, John (Kent, Faversham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks. N.R
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriesshire
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants.)
Moore, William
Morgan, David J. (Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Doherty, William
O'Dowd, John
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot. Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Burke, E. Haviland-

Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Channing, Francis Allston
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Delany, William
Dobbie, Joseph
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale
Harwood, George
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C.E.H. (Bristol, E.)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W.
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh, N.)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Malley, William
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Perks, Robert William
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries)
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Huddersf'd

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. J. H. Whitley and Mr. Trevelyan.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 9, after the word 'licence' to insert the words 'on the ground that the renewal would be void.'"—(*Sir Edward Carson.*)

Amendment agreed to.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS said he wished to move an Amendment further adding the words "or that any conditions upon which the licence was granted have not been fulfilled." He said this was an important matter, and went to the root of the question of good conduct. If it were not made perfectly clear in this section that the justices had the right to consider this vital point when they were asked to renew a licence, a serious weakening of their discretion would take place.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 9, after the word 'licence,' to insert the words 'or that any conditions upon which the licence was granted have not been fulfilled.'"—(*Mr. Herbert Roberts*).

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR EDWARD CARSON said that, as far as the form of the Amendment was concerned, the Government could not accept it. As regarded the substance, there was a good deal to be said for it. Where a person had given an undertaking of any importance to a licensing bench in the past as a condition of obtaining his licence, and broke that undertaking, he ought not to have any compensation. He did not think anybody could dispute that proposition. His opinion was that any man who had given such an undertaking, and broken it, was guilty of misconduct in the carrying on of the business. He did not say that because he did not want to make the matter perfectly right in the Bill, but he was afraid that if in this place it were laid down that there was to be no compensation in the event of a breach of undertaking, it would be argued afterwards on the construction of the section that the words "ill-conducted" were not as wide as at first sight they seemed to be. He really thought that to put in the words proposed would be to weaken the significance of the term "ill-conducted."

SIR ROBERT REID said he understood that they were agreed as regarded the principle. That was a matter for satisfaction. The Solicitor-General appeared to be afraid of the familiar rule in law that the specification of particular instances would weaken the effect of general words. He did not agree. For instance, the opening of a bar where an undertaking was given that it would not be opened would be extremely bad conduct; but would it mean that the premises were ill-conducted? He would suggest that the Amendment be accepted now, subject to further consideration on Report.

SIR EDWARD CARSON said he had the greatest possible regard for the opinion of the hon. and learned Gentleman; but he could not accept the words of the particular Amendment. He would, however, undertake to bring up words which would carry out the object to the fullest extent. He himself would prefer the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Sheffield.

MR. MOULTON (Cornwall, Launceston) said he thought the Amendment of the hon. Member for Sheffield would not meet the case. There were public-houses in the neighbourhood of the London markets that opened at very early hours. Such opening might be a breach of an undertaking; but would it mean that the house was ill-conducted?

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS said he would accept the suggestion of the Solicitor-General and withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

SIR JAMES WOODHOUSE (Huddersfield) moved to insert words excepting county boroughs from the scope of the clause, in order to call attention to the anomalous jurisdiction of county boroughs under this section. There was no doubt a great anomaly was created by the section. Whilst the full body of justices were to be competent under this Bill to deal with the question of structural fitness of the building, the conduct of the applicant, his fitness, and so forth, they would not be competent to deal with the question whether the house was required or not. Then there already existed a statutory committee, so that there would be under the Bill a full body of justices and a new statutory committee and the existing licensing committee of seven members. The licensing justices would not view that with any satisfaction at all. If there were to be an alteration it ought to be in the direction of giving the committee in the first instance the consideration of the matter, and afterwards refer it to the full body of the justices. He hoped the Solicitor-General would give him an assurance that the anomalies which undoubtedly the section created would be removed.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 9, after the words last inserted, to insert the words 'except in county boroughs.'"—(*Sir James Woodhouse.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR EDWARD CARSON said the Amendment was in the wrong place. Its proper place was in Clause 7. There was, however, a great deal in what the hon. Baronet had said, that there should be an appeal to the whole body of the magistrates; and he would undertake to have the matter considered, and some Amendment put down to meet his wishes.

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR (Liverpool, East Toxteth) asked if that would mean retaining the Recorder as chairman.

SIR EDWARD CARSON said it was intended to move an Amendment to omit the Recorder as chairman.

And, it being Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again to-morrow.

REGISTRATION OF NURSES.

Ordered, That Mr. Lyell be discharged from the Select Committee, and that Mr. Charles Hobhouse be added.—(*Mr. Herbert Gladstone.*)

GAS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 1) BILL.

Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill."—(*Mr. Bonar Law.*)

REGISTRATION OF NURSES.

Ordered, That Mr. Malcolm be discharged from the Select Committee, and that Mr. Mount be added. — (*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Sir A. ACLAND-HOOD, Somersetshire, Wellington), in moving the adjournment of the House, said that to-morrow the Licensing Bill would be first Order, and that it would, therefore, be the first allotted day.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH (Anglesey) asked if Friday would be an allotted day.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.) asked if there was any chance of the Land Bill being taken on Friday.

SIR A. ACLAND-HOOD said that the Prime Minister would make a statement to-morrow.

Adjourned at four minutes after Twelve o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 6th July, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Barrow-in-Furness Corporation Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

Barry Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill [Lords]; Oakengates and Dawley Joint Water Board Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed.

Milwr and District Mines Drainage Bill [Lords] (by Order). Consideration, as amended, deferred till Tuesday next.

Airdrie Corporation Gas Order Confirmation Bill [Lords]; Wishaw Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [Lords]. Considered, to be read the third time upon Friday.

Arbroath Corporation Water Order Confirmation Bill; Dunfermline District Water Order Confirmation Bill. Read a second time; to be considered upon Friday.

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP 9).

Sir Edward Strachey reported from the Committee on Group 9 of Railway Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Tuesday, 19th July, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; from Andover; Arnold; Arreton (two); Ashington; Awsworth; Ayr (two); Barnsley; Barrugh; Batley; Beccles; Blackburn; Blyth; Bolton (two): Broughton; Bucksburn; Bungay; Carlton; Chester le Street; Choppington (two); Clanville; Coedpoeth; Croydon; Cudworth; Cymmaes; Darfield; Deansgate; Dodworth; East Kirkby; Edge Hill; Egremont (three); Esholt; Gawber; Glamorgan (three); Glasgow; Gorseinon; Great Houghton; Grimesthorpe; Guisboro'; Hartlepool; Hemsworth; Hetton le Hole; High Wycombe; Hirst; Hove; Hurstbourne Priors; Keighley; Kensington; Leyland; Llwynhendy; Low Green; Lower Chute; Malton; Middlewich; Moor Row (three); Morpeth; Milton Green; New Basford; Newchurch; New Lenton; North Walsham; Nottingham (two); Osmaston; Overton; Portmadoc; Preston; Rhyl; Royston; St. Andrews; St. Meryn; Saltney; Seghill; Shafton; Sheffield; Shoreditch; South Hindley; Sowerby; Staincross; Stockport (two); Stone; Sunderland (two); Thruxton; Tranmere; Tregonna; Tulse Hill; Warrington; Weston Point; Wherwell; Whitchurch; Whittington; Wigton; Willington on Tyne; and Worthing; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petition from Nottingham, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

SEA FISHERIES BILL [Lords].

Petition from Lowestoft, against; to lie upon the Table.

SHOP HOURS BILL.

Petition of the Scottish Trade Protection Society, against; to lie upon the Table.

VALUATION BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Cannock; and Howden; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of Regulations for the Instruction and Training of Pupil Teachers from 1st August, 1904, to 31st July, 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

GOVERNMENT LABORATORY.

Copy presented, of Report of the Principal Chemist upon the work of the Government Laboratory for the year ended 31st March, 1904, with Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SUPERANNUATION.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 30th June, 1904, declaring that for the due and efficient discharge of the duties of the office of Director of Barrack Construction, War Office, professional or other peculiar qualifications not ordinarily to be acquired in the Public Service are required [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS.

Copy presented, of Index to Reports of His Majesty's Diplomatic and Consular Representatives Abroad on Trade and Subjects of General Interest (with Appendix), 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE WITH PERSIA.

Copy presented, of Report on the Condition and Prospects of British Trade in Persia, by H. W. Maclean, Special Commissioner of the Commercial Intelligence Committee of the Board of Trade [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3202 to 3206 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

FISHERY BOARD (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of Twenty-second Annual Report of the Fishery Board for Scotland, being for the year 1903. Part III. Scientific Investigations [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

DIPLOMATIC REPORTS (COAL).

Return ordered, "of Extracts relating to Coal from the Reports received up to the present date from His Majesty's Diplomatic and Consular Officers Abroad for 1903."—(*Mr. Fenwick.*)

IRON AND STEEL, 1903.

Copy ordered, "of Memorandum and Statistical Tables showing the production and consumption of Iron Ore and Pig Iron, and the production of Steel in the United Kingdom and the principal Foreign Countries in recent years, and the Imports and Exports of certain classes of Iron and Steel Manufactures (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 240, of Session 1903)."—(*Mr. Gerald Balfour.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Accidents caused by Motor-Cars, Horses, and Horse-drawn Vehicles.

MR. SCOTT-MONTAGU (Hampshire, New Forest): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can now give the number of accidents caused by motor-cars and by horses and horse-drawn vehicles in the year ended 31st May last.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) The figures for the Metropolitan Police District are given in the table below. It is to be noted that in the absence of information as to the total numbers of horses or of the various kinds of vehicles in use, there is no basis for a comparison between the figures. It is not practicable to give similar figures for the rest of the country outside the Metropolitan Police District.

Total number of accidents known to the police to have been due to the undermentioned causes within the Metropolitan Police District during the year ended the 31st May, 1904.

Cause of accident. 1.	Total number of accidents to persons or property. 2.	Number of accidents to property. 3.	Number of accidents to persons. 4.	Total number of persons injured in accidents shown in column 4. 5.	Nature of accidents to persons enumerated in column 4.		
					No. Slight. 6.	No. Serious. 7.	No. Fatal. 8.
Motor cars	1,624	1,281	462	510	424	73	13
Motor cycles	193	94	120	130	108	18	4
Horses	445	147	332	337	280	49	8
Horse-drawn vehicles	22,113	16,283	7,327	7,584	6,552	842	190
Totals	24,375	17,805	8,241	8,561	7,364	982	215

Hyde Park Corner—Slippery Wood Pavement.

Mr. H. C. RICHARDS (Finsbury, E.): To ask the hon. Member for Chorley, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, whether he will give directions that gravel or sand be placed upon the slippery wood pavement extending from the gateway of Constitution Hill across to the entrance of Hyde Park; and whether he is aware that up till 10 a.m. no such protection is given for drivers or riders crossing the wood pavement.

(*Answered by Lord Balcarres.*) The Westminster City Council are responsible for this road, and it would rest with them to provide gravel or sand as suggested.

Disposal of Bronze Lions from British Museum.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): To ask the hon. Member for Chorley, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, if he will state what has become of a number of bronze lions which were along the line of railings in front of the British Museum, and which were removed to widen the footway.

(*Answered by Lord Balcarres.*) Twelve lions were removed to St. Paul's Cathedral with the concurrence of the Trustees of the British Museum; the remainder are at the Museum, in charge of the Trustees.

Disposal of Colonnade from Burlington House.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: To ask the hon. Member for Chorley, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, if he will state what has become of the handsome stone colonnade (classical pillars, monoliths) formerly in front of Burlington House, Piccadilly, and removed by the Department of Works, and say why it is not re-erected in one of the Parks or elsewhere.

(*Answered by Lord Balcarres.*) The colonnade is lying in Battersea Park; the question of re-erecting it is now under the consideration of the First Commissioner.

Outdoor Medical Relief in the Metropolis.

Sir WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he will take steps to have a report made by the inspector now investigating the arrangements for outdoor medical relief in the Metropolis on the number of unions, if any, in which medical relief is granted on loan in the first instance, and on the practice of requiring applicants for medical relief to attend before the Board or a committee, with a statement of how long such practice has been in force and its effects on the number of applications.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) I will take steps to give effect to this suggestion as far as may be practicable.

Adulteration of Food—Recommendations of Royal Commission.

Sir CUTHBERT QUILTER (Suffolk, Sudbury): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, in pursuance of their powers, the Board propose to take action on the lines recommended by the Royal Commission on Arsenical Poisoning in Part VIIIa. of their Report, by the appointment of a special expert officer, or otherwise. for securing better control over the purity of chemically prepared, preserved, or other foods liable to contain deleterious substances; and whether progress has been made in giving effect to the further recommendation of the Royal Commission, that the principle of officially prescribed food standards already enforced in the case of certain articles of diet should be applied to other foods and beverages.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) I have not at present decided to appoint a special expert officer of the kind referred to. The consideration of the recommendations of the Royal Commission is being proceeded with, and in connection with it the proposal with regard to the appointment of such an officer will receive attention. Effect, however, could not be given to the recommendations as to food standards without legislation.

Report of Boiler Committee.

Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty when the Final Report of the Boiler Committee will be in the hands of Members; and whether he can give the House any statement as to the coal consumption in the case of Belleville boilers as compared with that in the case of Babcock boilers or Yarrow boilers.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) The Final Report of the Boiler Committee was received on the 2nd instant, and is now under consideration. It is hoped that it will shortly be in the hands of Members. The coal used per H.P. per hour on the trials conducted by the Boiler Committee was as follows:—

Babcock and Wilcox	1·8 lbs. to 2·1 lbs.
Belleville - -	1·8 lbs. to 2·1 lbs.
Yarrow large tube -	1·9 lbs. to 2·2 lbs.

By-laws under the Employment of Children Act.

MR TENNANT (Berwickshire): To ask the Secretary for Scotland how many sets of by-laws under the Employment of Children Act, 1903, have been sent to him for confirmation; what local authorities have sent these by-laws, and in how many, and what, cases the sanction of his Department has been given.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) Proposed by-laws have been received from the town councils of Ayr and Glasgow, the county council of Dumfries, and the school boards of Greenock, Ayr, Glasgow, Stirling, Paisley, Perth, Annan, Govan Parish, Gourock, Leith, Peebles, Crieff, Blantyre Parish, Ardrossan. The proposed by-laws have been or are being locally advertised, and are now under consideration in connection with objections submitted in the respective cases. No by-laws have as yet been sanctioned.

New Scheme for Whitstable Charities.

MR. SLACK (Hertfordshire, St. Albans): To ask the hon. Member for Tonbridge, as Parliamentary Charity Commissioner, whether, before sanctioning and sealing the new scheme for the Whitstable Charities, he will so amend it that the endowment originally provided for the payment of teachers' salaries shall continue to be paid to the local education authority as provided by Section 13 of The Education Act, 1902.

(*Answered by Mr. Griffith Boscawen.*) The Commissioners do not understand that any payment has been made to the local education authority from this Charity; and whether any such payment ought under any circumstances to be made is a matter not for the Commissioners, but for the Board of Education. In the circumstances the Commissioners have nothing to add to their Answer of 1st July.†

Mr. J. Robinson's Farm at Ballinacross.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any application has been made to the Estates Commissioners to purchase the farm of Ballinacross from Mr. John Robinson, Sub-Sheriff of county Longford, who is willing to sell same for the benefit of the representatives of the evicted tenants, and with a view to their restoration thereto.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) No application has been made to the Commissioners for the sale of this farm.

Sale of the O'Brien Estate.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland to state the present position of the negotiations for the sale of the O'Brien Estate at Corglass and Cornakelly; and whether, in view of the delay in completing this sale, the Estates Commissioners will apply to Judge Ross for a request to issue under the 7th Section of the Act of 1903.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) I am informed by the registrar of the Land Judge's Court that the notice in Form 10 prescribed by the rules of 10th January, 1902, is about to be served. The solicitor having carriage of the sale is also acting for the tenants, and this would seem to afford a guarantee that no unnecessary delay will take place in bringing about a sale. The case will not be lost sight of by the Land Judge.

Promotion of Sergeant Ryan—Royal Irish Constabulary.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that

---

† See page 317.

Sergeant Ryan, of the Royal Irish Constabulary, in Belfast, was some time ago found in an ill-conducted house; if so, will he state whether his conduct on this occasion was reported to his superior officer and what punishment, if any, was inflicted; and will he explain on what grounds has Ryan been promoted to the rank of head constable.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The incident referred to in the first part of the Question occurred in January, 1896. Sergeant Ryan did not deny that he had entered the house, but stated he had done so with the object of endeavouring to trace stolen property. He was reported to be an excellent officer, and as there was no evidence to show that he entered the house for any purpose other than that stated by him, the Inspector-General considered that the necessities of the case would be sufficiently met by a caution against entering such a house in future. In July, 1900, he was permitted, on the recommendation of his officers, to compete for promotion to the rank of head constable. He was successful, and was promoted in October, 1900.

Belfast Police—Alleged Preference given to Roman Catholics.

Mr. SLOAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state why all the appointments made at Henry Street Police Barracks, Belfast, during the year 1902, and carrying with them extra pay, were given to Roman Catholics; and can he state the number of men stationed at this barrack, how many are Roman Catholics and how many are Protestants, including the district inspector who is in charge.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) Two such appointments were made in the year 1902. Both men are Roman Catholics, but the appointments were not determined by considerations of religion. In one case the extra pay amounts to a shilling weekly, and the recipient lost a night-watch allowance of similar amount. There are fifty-two men at Henry Street Barrack, twenty-eight are Roman Catholics, and twenty-four Protestants. The district inspector is a Roman Catholic.

Decorations at Roundstone—Action of Police.

Mr. SLOAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that flags and banners were some time ago hung out of all the public-houses in Roundstone, county Galway; that the Reverend Father Gleeson sent a written complaint to Sir Antony M'Donnell against Sergeant Ryan and Constable Laidley for explaining to certain publicans that it was illegal to hang flags from their licensed premises; and that the sergeant was severely reprimanded and the constable transferred because of performing this duty; and, if so, will he say whether an opportunity was given to Ryan and Laidley to refute the charges contained in Father Gleeson's letter; if not, will he lay a copy of the letter upon the Table.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The replies to the first two queries are in the affirmative. On inquiry it transpired that only one publican was informed that a display of flags was illegal. The occasion on which these emblems were displayed was the eve of the visit to Roundstone of the newly-appointed Archbishop of Tuam, the first visit after his appointment. The flags exhibited were not Party emblems of the character contemplated by the statute 6 and 7 Will. 4, cap. 38, sec. 9, and as it appeared that the constable had acted without reference to the district inspector or head constable, the Inspector-General considered that his interference was improper, and he so informed him. The sergeant was exonerated from blame. Constable Laidley's transfer had no connection with this incident. The Inspector-General considered he had shown distinct sectarian feeling while stationed at Roundstone, and the county inspector was of opinion that, in the interests of the public service, it was necessary to transfer him to another station. Explanations were furnished by both the sergeant and constable in respect of the matters alleged against them by the Reverend Mr. Gleeson.

Cost of Conveying Militia Artillery from the North to Portsmouth.

Sir JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state approximately the estimated cost of conveyance to and from Portsmouth of the Militia Artillery Corps from Lancashire, Durham, Northumberland, and various parts of Scotland for the purpose of mobilisation under the existing arrangements.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The estimated cost is as follows :—

	£
Northumberland Royal Garrison Artillery (Militia) . . .	1,150
Lancashire Royal Garrison Artillery (Militia) . . .	400
The Duke of Edinburgh's Royal Garrison Artillery (Militia) .	1,650
Fife Royal Garrison Artillery (Militia)	1,000
Forfar and Kincardine Royal Garrison Artillery (Militia) .	1,250
Durham Royal Garrison Artillery (Militia)	1,150
The South-East of Scotland Royal Garrison Artillery (Militia)	1,000
	£7,600

North of England Militia Artillery Training.

Sir JOHN COLOMB: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the Militia Artillery Corps, forming part of the war garrison of Portsmouth but belonging to Lancashire, Durham, Northumberland, and various parts of Scotland, have at their own local headquarters the means of training at guns and artillery appliances exactly corresponding to those they have to serve when mobilised at Portsmouth.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) Units of Militia Garrison Artillery are trained every third year at least at the fortresses to which they are allotted for mobilisation, and during other years at a work of defence armed with a modern armament. The cost of providing at the local headquarters appliances exactly corresponding to those the corps have to serve in a modern fortress, such as Portsmouth, would be prohibitive.

Attendance of a Deputy Judge-Advocate at Courts-Martial in India.

Mr. H. D. GREENE (Shrewsbury): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether any regulation has been recently adopted as to dispensing with or otherwise altering the attendance at Courts-Martial in India of a Deputy Judge-Advocate, and on what grounds, and whether such change was approved by the Government before it was made; and, if so, whether the presence of an independent official possessing special legal knowledge is no longer considered requisite to safeguard the interests of accused soldiers at Courts-Martial.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) No report on the subject has been received from the Government of India. I will make inquiries.

Medal for Naval Service against Fenians in 1868.

Mr. MOON (St. Pancras, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies why the services of those who were detailed for naval service in Canada against the Fenians in 1868 have not been recognised by the reward of a medal.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) Medals were granted to those who were engaged in repelling the Fenian raids of 1866 and 1870, and in the Red River Expedition of 1870, but it was not considered desirable to grant the medal to men who served in the defence of the Dominion along the frontier in other years about that period, since their services practically amounted to policing the frontier, and they were not engaged in actual military operations.

Import Duty on Magazines in Australia.

Mr. RUNCIMAN (Dewsbury): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether his attention has been called to the announcement made by the Australian Commonwealth Government that from 19th August next all magazines and periodicals containing more than 15 per cent. of advertising matter will be liable to an import duty of 3d. per lb.; whether he is aware that the effect of this duty will be to exclude from a British Colony a number of British magazines and periodicals; and what steps he proposes to take in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) I have not yet seen the notification of the

Australian Government to which the hon. Member refers, but I will inquire whether such a notification has been issued and will draw the attention of the Commonwealth Government to the probable effect of the proposal to which the hon. Member refers. The matter, however, must be left to the discretion of that Government to take what action they think fit.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Admiralty Contractors and the Fair Wages Resolution—Case of Messrs. Lysaght, of Bristol.

Mr. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether Messrs. Lysaght, of Bristol, are contractors for the Admiralty; and, if so, whether it has been brought to his notice that Messrs. Lysaght are discharging men from their employment on account of their membership of a trade union, in contravention of the Fair Wages Resolution of the House of Commons, which has been adopted by all Government Departments; and, if so, what steps he proposes to take in the matter.

The SECRETARY to the ADMIRALTY (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge): The Answer to the first part of the hon. Member's Question is in the affirmative, and to the second part in the negative. The Fair Wages Resolution of the House of Commons does not appear to lay down any guidance for dealing with cases of this character, unless it can be shown that the firm are paying less than the current rate of wages.

Mr. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: Does the Secretary to the Admiralty intend the House to understand that the question of the preferential employment of non-unionists as against unionists is not raised by the Resolution?

Mr. PRETYMAN: I do not think there is anything regarding that in the Fair Wages Resolution.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): Will the hon. Member acquaint himself with the circulars issued by the Treasury on the subject?

Machine Guns in the Regular Army.

Captain NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office if he will state the number of Maxims, Nordenfelt, and Gardner machine guns, respectively, in use in the Regular Army; the number required to complete the armament; the number of each ordered for the present financial year, and where the orders have been placed; and also the cost of manufacture at Enfield Small Arms Factory, and the price paid to private firms for each class of gun.

*The FINANCIAL SECRETARY to the WAR OFFICE (Mr. Bromley Davenport, Cheshire, Macclesfield): There are in use in the Regular Army 990 Maxims, 33 Nordenfelts and 90 Gardner machine guns and a reserve of 25 per cent is held. The number of guns required to complete the armament is 110 Maxim guns; 81 are available for issue in store and 80 are still due on last year's orders. 100 Maxim guns have been ordered this year, one-half being placed with the Ordnance Factories and one-half with Messrs. Vickers, Maxim and Company. The only private firm manufacturing Maxim guns is Vickers, Maxim and Company, whose invention the gun is, and when arrangements were made with them for manufacture by them and the Ordnance Factories an undertaking was given not to divulge the price paid.

War Office Contracts—Messrs. Lysaght and the Fair Wages Resolution.

Mr. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether Messrs. Lysaght, of Bristol, are contractors for the War Office; and, if so, whether it has been brought to his notice that Messrs. Lysaght are discharging men from their employment on account of their membership of a trade union, in contravention of the Fair Wages Resolution of the House of Commons, which has been adopted by all Government Departments; and, if so, what steps he proposes to take in the matter.

Mr. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: The statements of fact contained in the hon.

Member's Question, as to which I have no knowledge, do not indicate any contravention of the Fair Wages Resolution, which obliges this firm, and any firm employed under a Government contract, to pay the rate of wages generally accepted as current for similar work in the same district.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: Is it a fact that Messrs. Lysaght are doing work for the War Office, and, if so, will the War Office not consider themselves bound to interfere in a case where preference is shown to non-unionists as against unionists.

MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: We do employ Messrs. Lysaght, but under the Fair Wages Resolution there is no obligation on us to compel them to employ any particular persons, unionist or non-unionist.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: The hon. Gentleman has said that even if the facts are as set forth, the War Office would have no right to interfere.

MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: No, I did not say that.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: Will the hon. Gentleman acquaint himself with the evidence taken before the Fair Wages Committee, and the debates in which a positive pledge was given on this subject?

MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: I will.

MR. BROADHURST (Leicester): Will the hon. Gentleman also make himself acquainted with the facts as to whether men are being discharged or not.

MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: I will make inquiries, but in any case I am not clear that we have any power.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): Is it not the case that in August, 1893, the then Secretary of the Treasury and myself, speaking on behalf of the Government——

*MR. SPEAKER: That is a Question of which, I think, notice should be given.

Retired Volunteers.

MR. CHARLES ALLEN (Gloucestershire, Stroud): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether there is any available record of the number of retired Volunteers under thirty years of age who, during their term of service, were efficient for not less than three years.

MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: The Answer is in the negative.

Expenditure on Rifle Ranges.

MR. TILLETT (Norwich): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will say how much of the £40,000 set aside in 1899 for rifle ranges has been actually appropriated; where such new ranges have been constructed; and whether they are open or screened.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, N.): The £40,000 originally allotted from the Military Works Loan, 1899, for Volunteer ranges was subsequently increased to £170,000. It has been all appropriated as shown in the Return which I have the pleasure of handing to the hon. Member. The money has been utilised in assisting Volunteers in providing range accommodation suitable for the ·303 rifle, either by extending or improving existing ranges or constructing new ones. The ranges for which grants have been made are all open ranges except five, viz., Oxford, Lincoln, Norton (Stockton-on-Tees), Kirkland (Fife), and Clifton, which are screened.

South African Constabulary.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the force suggested by the Government for the new South African Constabulary in 1901 was 10,000 men, whether he can say when the intention was formed that the force should consist of only 6,000, and when the strength was reduced to 5,000; whether he can state up to what date he possesses the Return of actual strength, and if he can give the figure of the actual strength at the date of the last Return; what was the original estimate of cost for 10,000 constabulary; and what is the expenditure contributed by the Transvaal towards the South African Constabulary in the present year.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. LYTTELTON, Warwick and Leamington): It was decided to constitute such a force towards the end of 1900. Lord Roberts considered that the force should be 10,000, as the extra number would obviate the need of more Regular troops for the work then required, but from the beginning Lord Milner maintained that 6,000 would be sufficient for police purposes when the war was over, and that fewer would be required after a time. The force was reduced to 5,000 in the course of the present April. The last Return of strength is dated 1st June and gives the actual strength as 4,770. The original estimate was £250 per man, or a total cost of £2,500,000 per annum. The cost of the constabulary is provided in the Inter-colonial Budget and not directly on the Transvaal Estimates. Towards the deficit on the Inter-colonial Budget for the year ended 30th June the Transvaal is contributing a sum of £767,000. In general explanation, I would refer the right hon. Member to pages 30 and 51 of Blue-book, Cd. 2102.

Sunday Labour in Transvaal Mines.

MR. SLACK (Hertfordshire, St. Albans): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in view of the fact that one of the conditions of the agreement under which Chinese labourers are being introduced into the Transvaal provides that Sunday labour shall be optional, and to the fact that a conference has been summoned by the Johannesburg Free Church Council (which defended the introduction of Chinese labour) to protest against this condition, he proposes to take any, and, if so, what action in the matter.

MR. LYTTELTON: The contract provides that Sundays shall be holidays and that labourers are not bound to work on that day. Under the Sunday Labour Law, no ordinary mining work is done on Sundays, as I have been informed, but only work which is absolutely necessary, such as pumping, repairs, etc. I have not had the conference referred to brought to my notice, but I will make inquiry on the subject.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the stamps, etc., are running every day and that the mining goes on on Sundays just the same as on ordinary days?

MR LOUGH (Islington, W.): Why is it necessary to do repairs and pumping on Sundays?

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax): Are not these labourers paid on the basis of thirty days per month?

MR. LYTTELTON: Of thirty working days per month.

Boer Repatriation—Expenditure.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS (Carnarvonshire, Eifion): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has now ascertained from Lord Milner whether he is willing to furnish a detailed statement of the moneys expended in repatriation of the Boers after the war, and in compensation for losses sustained by them in or in consequence of the war, and stating the name and address of every person who received £100 or upwards of such moneys, and on what account the same was received.

MR. LYTTELTON: I have referred the hon. Member's request to Lord Milner, and he informs me that the suggested limitation of the Return to recipients of £100 and upwards would not materially affect the reasons for which I stated that such a Return could not conveniently be prepared, as involving an unjustifiable expenditure of time and money.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that there is considerable anxiety in South Africa as to whether the money has been properly expended, and is it not desirable to allay that feeling whatever the expense?

MR. LYTTELTON was understood to reply that wherever there was money to be distributed there was always anxiety.

MR. MARKHAM: Will the right hon. Gentleman give a Return showing the names of the persons whose farms were sold during the time of the war while they were fighting for their country.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS: I shall raise the question on the Colonial Vote.

Repatriation Loan.

MR. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies how much of the £5,800,000 spent out of the Guaranteed Loan for repatriation purposes under Head III. was spent on cost of administration.

MR. LYTTELTON: I am not able to state the amount spent on administration until I receive Lord Milner's final report. I would refer the hon. Member to Sir Arthur Lawley's observations on the point at page 64 of Cd. 1895.

The Somali Mullah.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what is the present position of the Somali Mullah, stating the estimated number of his followers, and the amount of rifles and ammunition in his possession.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl PERCY, Kensington, S.): We have no definite information as to the present position of the Mullah or strength of his following, and the report that he has returned to the Nogal Valley is not confirmed.

Administration of Somaliland.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs how many officers have been sent out in the last three months upon special service to Somaliland; whether any military operations are taking place in that country, and what force it will be necessary to maintain in the Protectorate in order to preserve peace; whether he can state what number of officers will be required in future to administer the Government there.

*EARL PERCY: No special service officers have been sent out since the termination of the war, and no military operations are now taking place. Two Indian regiments and two companies of mounted infantry will remain as a temporary garrison pending the reorganisation of the local forces. The normal European staff of the Protectorate consists of eleven civil and ten military officers.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: What was the date of the termination of the war?

*EARL PERCY said he could not give the exact date when military operations were supposed to have terminated. His Answer referred to the period when the Foreign Office took over the control.

Somaliland Protectorate Boundaries and Administration.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether His Majesty's Government contemplate any immediate demarcation of the area of the Protectorate in Somaliland which, by the Order in Council just made by His Majesty, has been placed in charge of a Commissioner; whether this Commissioner is to act under the direction of the Foreign Office, or, if not, under the direction of what Department or official, and whether he is to be in any way instructed either from Aden or from Bombay; and whether he can give the House any information as to the recent movements and present position of the Mullah.

*EARL PERCY: The Answer to the first paragraph is in the negative; the Commissioner is to act under the direction of the Foreign Office. As regards the last paragraph, I must refer the right hon. Gentleman to the reply which I have given to-day to the hon. Member for South Molton.

Sugar Convention Expenditure.

MR. SAMUEL YOUNG (Cavan, E.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he will give the total sum and the chief details of the expenditure during the last financial year on or in connection with the Sugar Convention and the Permanent Committee at Brussels from money voted by Parliament.

*EARL PERCY: The total expenditure was about £1,200. The principal items other than expenses for maintenance and travelling are: £700 for the remuneration of the British Delegate and of the Assistant Delegate, and £140 for the British share of the expenses of the Permanent Committee.

Macedonia—European Officers of Gendarmerie.

MR. CHARLES ALLEN: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Government has acquiesced in Hilmi Pacha's circular limiting the duties of the European officers of *gendarmerie* in Macedonia to technical instruction of their men, and confining the right to receive complaints from the inhabitants to the civil assessors.

*EARL PERCY: In an interview with Sir N. O'Conor, the Grand Vizier stated that he was not aware that any instructions had been sent to the Inspector-General in the sense of the alleged circular alluded to by the hon. Member, and the reports of Colonel Fairholme indicate that the British officers are receiving the cordial co-operation of the Turkish authorities.

Proof Spirit in Sweets imported from the Continent—Restriction of Sale.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether his attention has been drawn to the importation into this country by German and other Continental manufacturers of quantities of sweets, particularly chocolates, containing a large percentage of proof spirit; and whether, having regard to the danger of the sale of such articles to children, the Board of Inland Revenue propose to take steps to check such sale: and whether he will state under what conditions, if any, such articles are allowed to be sold without a licence.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): The hon. Member was good enough to draw my attention to this matter by a private letter. I have been in communication with the Board of Inland Revenue on the subject. The only thing that they can do is to insist that goods containing an appreciable percentage of spirit should not be sold by any person not holding a spirit retail licence, and they are issuing warnings to that effect in such cases as appear to them to require it.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): May I ask whether a proportionate duty is levied on these goods?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I think so.

Alcohol for Manufacturing Purposes.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he has yet formulated any experimental scheme for the production and sale of alcohol for manufacturing and industrial purposes; whether he is aware that alcohol can be manufactured at fourpence a gallon from such materials as bad potatoes and mildewed grain; whether his attention has been drawn to the extent of German trade in this respect; and whether he intends to allow such spirits to be blended in bonded warehouses and sold as pure whiskey.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I am not quite clear as to what the hon. Member refers. I would, however, refer him to Section 8 of the Finance Act, 1902. I may at the same time mention that I am considering whether it would be advisable to alter the present law which prohibits the sale of methylated spirit by retailers in quantities of more than one gallon. As regards the cost of certain forms of alcohol, and its composition, and the extent of the German trade in such forms of alcohol, I have seen statements to the effect (more or less) of those made by the hon. Member, but I have no official information on the subject. And, with reference to his last Question, I have nothing to add to the reply given to the hon. Member on Wednesday the 22nd June† to a somewhat similar Question.

MR. MACVEAGH: Cannot the right hon. Gentleman get information from the Customs officials as to the extent of the German trade?

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxvi., 827.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I do not think I can. They cannot get information as to the sources from which the spirit is obtained. When spirit is imported as silent spirit it is absolutely impossible by any analysis to say how it has been made. It is pure spirit and nothing but that.

Mr. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): What is silent spirit?

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Absolutely pure spirit.

Major JAMESON (Clare, W.): Cannot the right hon. Gentleman ascertain the quantity of the spirit imported from Germany.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Yes, I could obtain that, but I could not say how it was made, whether from potatoes or mildewed grain. I have no means of arriving at the sources from which it is manufactured.

Mr. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.): Have you any information as to the amount of such spirit blended in the bonded warehouses and sold as whiskey?

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! That does not arise out of the Answer.

Mails in County Fermanagh.

Mr. EDWARD MITCHELL (Fermanagh, N.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he is aware that since May last mid-day mail bags from Belleek, Irvinestown, Billinamallard, and other places, have been abolished, while previous to this letters could be posted early in the day and delivered in Enniskillen at 2 o'clock p.m.; that, under the present conditions, letters posted in any of the places mentioned have necessarily to go viâ Omagh, and take a long time in delivery; and, if so, will he consider the advisabilty of improving the present postal system in the places referred to.

The POSTMASTER - GENERAL (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton): I will have inquiry made on the subject, and will acquaint the hon. Member with the result.

Government Education Grant—Method of Distribution.

Dr. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether he is now in a position to make a statement relative to the r presentations which have been made to him concerning the hardship to poorer schools, and especially to country schools, likely to arise under the method of distributing Government grants to elementary schools proposed under Article 31* of the Education Code for 1904–5, and relative also to the difficulties in registration which that proposed distribution will involve.

The PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY to the BOARD of EDUCATION (Sir William Anson, Oxford University): The total result of the method of distributing grants proposed in the Code would not involve a loss to local education authorities, taking the country as a whole; but it appears that some of the rural counties and some of the boroughs would incur a small, but an appreciable loss. I am of opinion that very slight improvement of attendance generally, and some better arangement as to the attendance of children under the by-laws relating to partial exemption, would cancel the losses which at present would arise in certain areas if the proposed change were carried into effect. But in view of the fact that under existing circumstances the change cannot be introduced without involving these losses the Board will revert to the system hitherto in force; at the same time they hope that in another year or two the methods proposed in the Code for 1904 may be brought into use without risk of hardship to any local education authority, rural or urban.

Dr. MACNAMARA: Will the hon. Baronet issue a Minute setting up the arrangement to which it is proposed to revert.

Sir WILLIAM ANSON: Certainly.

Irish Agricultural Organisation Society.

Mr. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Department of Agriculture exercise any supervision over the annual sums granted to the Irish Agricultural Organisation Society; and by what power and authority are such sums granted, seeing that this society, aided by public money, is in direct competition with other similar societies dealing in Irish agricultural produce.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Wyndham, Dover): The sums paid to the society have been in respect of the remuneration and expenses of its officials whom the Department has employed from time to time instead of appointing additional officers on its staff. No payments have been made by way of grant. The Act of 1899 authorises the Department to apply its funds, with the concurrence of the Agricultural Board, for the purposes of promoting agricultural and other rural industries.

Mr. FLYNN (Cork County, N.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that this society is in direct competition with private enterprise all over Ireland?

Mr. WYNDHAM: I do not know if that is an accurate description, and even if it were I think the action of the society is one we ought to view with pleasure. The duty of the Department is to spend money for the promotion of agriculture, and, as I have said, it has simply employed officials of the society instead of increasing its own staff.

Land Purchase—The Macgillycuddy's Estate, County Kerry.

Mr. MURPHY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutentant of Ireland whether the attention of the Estates Commissioners has been directed to the sale of The Macgillycuddy's Estate, county Kerry, in the Land Judge's Court; whether they are aware that the holding of Mr. Daniel Shea, an evicted tenant who has made application to the Commissioners already, is situated at Cleeny on this estate, and held by the Earl of Kenmare as a middleman under The Macgillycuddy; and whether the Estates Commissioners have taken any, and, if any, what, steps to safeguard the interests of the evicted tenant.

Mr. WYNDHAM: Proceedings for sale of a portion of this estate were recently pending in the Land Judge's Court. On the application of the owner, however, proceedings were stayed, and an order was made enabling him to negotiate for a sale of the whole of the property to the Estates Commissioners. The application received from the evicted tenant will be duly considered.

Mr. MURPHY: Can we rely on the right hon. Gentleman to see that this evicted tenant is reinstated?

Mr. WYNDHAM: I have every confidence that the Commissioners will do their duty.

American Duties on Irish Cured Fish.

Mr. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any steps have been taken by the Irish Government with a view to induce the American Government to withdraw the prohibitory tariff proposed to be imposed on Irish cured fish imported into that country.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The Irish Government communicated with the Foreign Office on the subject. My noble friend the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs states that the alteration in the method of assessing the duty is due to a ruling by the Board of General Appraisers. Against this ruling there is a right of appeal to the Circuit Court of the district, and, under certain circumstances, a further appeal to the Supreme Court It would appear that advantage has already been taken of this right of appeal, and my noble friend does not consider that any useful purpose would be served by making representations to the United States Government at the present stage. But the matter will be closely watched and representations made when they are likely to have good results.

Mr. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that this increased taxation is practically killing the Irish mackerel fishing industry?

Blennerhassett's Estate, Kerry—Case of Daniel Murphy.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have received an application for reinstatement in his farm from Daniel Murphy, Dromin, Milltown, county Kerry; whether he is aware that the greater part of the estate (A. Blennerhassett's Estate) on which the farm is situated is already purchased; that the present holder of the farm (Mr. Wharton) has no judicial title; and, if so, whether steps will be taken, under the provisions of the Land Act, 1903, to have Mr. Murphy reinstated.

MR. WYNDHAM: The greater part of this property was sold some time ago to the occupiers under previous Land Purchase Acts. No application has been received by the Estates Commissioners in respect of the sale of the remainder, nor have they received any application on behalf of the reinstatement of Daniel Murphy.

Fishing Rights at Ballynahinch.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the water bailiffs at Ballynahinch, county Down, continually interfere with the rights of individuals fishing either with rod or line; and will he give instructions for their interference to cease.

MR. WYNDHAM: There have, I believe, been several cases of interference by bailiffs with persons fishing legally with rod and line at this place. Further inquiries are being made in the matter by the new Department, the result of which I will communicate to my hon. friend.

Game Rights on the Clanricarde Estate, County Galway.

MR. ROCHE (Galway, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that in August or September, 1902, the Clanricarde tenants at Derrygoolan, county Galway, refused to allow strangers or poachers to trespass on their lands in pursuit of game, those tenants being in possession of their holdings for many years as tenants from year to year, and consequently the owners of the game rights on their farms; that on the 12th August, 1903, the same tenants again refused to allow strangers or poachers to shoot over their lands, although those outsiders were accompanied by police as a protection force; and whether, in view of the fact that no action has been taken since autumn, 1902, either by the landlord, Lord Clanricarde, or anybody else, to contest the tenants' right to the game on their holdings, a police protection force will be refused to any party endeavouring to shoot over these lands, to whom the tenants have refused permission.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am not informed of the particulars of events which the hon. Member states took place in 1902–1903. The attendance of police on such occasions is solely to prevent serious breaches of the peace, and is not to prevent any person entitled to a legal right from asserting it in a lawful manner. If the tenants are the aggressors and remove the so-called strangers, the latter can proceed civilly or criminally for assault. If the so-called strangers are the aggressors, then the tenants can proceed civilly before the County Court or before the magistrates for trespass in pursuit of game, and thus have the legal rights of the respective parties determined in a Court of Law. I cannot and ought not to pronounce an opinion as to the rights of the respective parties, being, as I am, in ignorance of the nature of the contract of tenancy between the landlords and tenants.

MR. KILBRIDE: Does the right hon. Gentleman deny that these tenants are tenants from year to year and were so previously to the passing of the Land Act of 1881?

MR. WYNDHAM: No.

MR. KILBRIDE: Will you inquire from the police if the statements in my Question are correct, and whether, also, an offer of 1s. per head has been made to the tenants for every bird killed?

In reply to Mr. ROCHE,

MR. WYNDHAM said the police would only go to the place if there was reason to believe that there might be a breach of the peace.

MR. KILBRIDE: What does the right hon. Gentleman think would be a lawful and legitimate protest under these circumstances?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

Larne Urban Council.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN (Kilkenny, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received a memorial from the Urban Council of Larne (county Antrim) praying for an increase in the number of councillors; and, if so, will he state what action he proposes to take in the matter.

MR. WYNDHAM: The district council has made application to the county council for an increase in the number of urban councillors. It is for the county council to consider the application and, should it be of opinion that a *prima facie* case is made out, to cause an inquiry to be made in pursuance of Article 26 of the Application of Enactments Order.

Belfast Corporation—Outbreaks of Infectious Disease.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to a resolution passed by the Works Committee of the Belfast Corporation, held on 29th June, declaring that, owing to the serious and periodical outbreaks of infectious diseases in the City of Belfast, the attention of the Public Health Department be called to the present system of dumping the refuse, which must contain germs of disease, on ground intended for building purposes; and whether, seeing that the system has been encouraged rather than repressed by the Belfast Corporation, he will, in the interests of the health of the community, cause inquiries to be made by the Local Government Board into this practice with a view to its discontinuance.

MR. WYNDHAM: The resolution of the Works Committee is under the consideration of the Corporation. As already stated, the Local Government Board has received no complaints in the matter. The Board's Medical Inspector will, however, make inquiries.

Tobacco Growing in Ireland.

MR. DAVID MORGAN (Essex, Walthamstow): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can furnish particulars as to the arrangements made for the experimental growing of tobacco in Ireland; and if such experimental growing will be carried on in different parts of Ireland, so that reliable trials may be made on a fairly large area of ground, in four or five different localities, thus enabling an opinion to be formed as to the results in different districts.

MR. WYNDHAM: In 1900, 1901, and 1902 experiments under the supervision of the Department were undertaken at a number of selected centres in Ireland, the results of which have satisfied the Department that the tobacco plant can be successfully cultivated in that country. In order, however, to determine the possible commercial value to the country of tobacco cultivation, arrangements were made for the growing of the crop on about twenty acres in the vicinity of Navan during the present year. Until the Department has satisfied itself with respect to the actual financial result, it will not be in a position to consider the question of the initiation of similar experiments elsewhere.

MR. FLAVIN: Has it been brought to the notice of the right hon. Gentleman that tobacco was successfully grown in Tralee. Why have not the Department experimented in more than one county?

MR. WYNDHAM: I think my Answer covers that ground.

Rathmines Commissioners and the Dublin County Council.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Local Government Board have sought the counsel and advice of the Law Officers of the Crown to guide them in their decision on the appeal of the Rathmines Commissioners against the decision of the Dublin County Council.

Mr. WYNDHAM: No, Sir. I stated in reply to a Question by the hon. Member for South Dublin on the 20th June,† that the Board has authority to obtain the opinion of counsel in important cases, and that should it become necessary to consult the Law Officers of the Crown in the present case the Attorney-General will alone advise.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: Why not the Solicitor-General? Why is the exception made in this case?

[No answer was returned.]

Trawling in Muir Bay.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, whether it has come to the knowledge of the Fisheries Branch of the Department of Technical and Agricultural Instruction that eight trawling boats, whose decks have been seen strewn several inches deep with fish spawn, have been constantly operating on Sundays and week days for the past month across the entrance to Muir Bay, to the loss and injury to the means of livelihood of the local fishermen; has the "Granuaile" yet made the long-promised surprise visit to the neighbourhood of Muir Bay; and what steps, if any, does the Government propose to take, with the view of securing the fishermen from deprivation of their livelihood by the illegal practice of trawling.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The waters in question are closed to trawling inside defined limits, which are locally well known; but the Department has no information that trawling has been carried out within the prohibited area. It is giving the matter close attention, however, and if an infraction of the law is brought to notice it will institute proceedings. It was only on the 25th June that a promise was given that the "Granuaile" would visit the waters. The element of surprise will disappear if the hon. Member presses me to give indications of the visit's probable date.

Blacklion Dispensary, Enniskillen Union.

Mr. JORDAN (Fermanagh, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been drawn to the report of Dr. M'Carthy, made to the Local Government Board on the 30th May last, in reference to the condition of the Blacklion Dispensary in the Enniskillen Union, and to his statements that the rooms are filled with accumulations of old bottles and rubbish, and that vigorous action is needed to remedy this state of affairs, and as to the unsuitability of the rooms used for the dispensary for children and delicate and elderly patients; and, if so, will he take steps to compel the improvement of these premises, or insist on the guardians providing another house instead of that now occupied by the dispensary.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The attention of the guardians has been directed to this report, and the Board has no reason to doubt they will take suitable action to remedy the condition of things complained of.

Ballinasloe Union Medical Officer.

Mr. ROCHE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state on what grounds the Local Government Board has refused to sanction the increase of £10 a year to £130 in the salary of Dr. Collins, the Protestant Medical Officer of Ballinasloe Union; whether he is aware that all the Catholic guardians are in favour of the proposed increase; and whether the Local Government Board, although withholding its sanction of this increase to an experienced Poor Law officer, has sanctioned initial salaries of larger amount for medical officers without Poor Law experience.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The Board has no knowledge of the religious persuasions of Dr. Collins and the guardians. The Board refused to sanction the proposed increase of salary, because of the small amount of work recorded as having been performed in Dr. Collins' district, and in view of the fact that his salary was increased to its present amount so recently as 1902. The Board, however, expressed its willingness to consider any reasonable scale of salary which might be formulated by the guardians, and made applicable to the entire medical staff of the union.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxvi., 491.

Every case is considered on its merits, and higher initial salaries have only been allowed where they were warranted by circumstances.

MR. ROCHE: Will the right hon. Gentleman inform the Local Government Board that Dr. Collins is a medical officer, and that the increase of the salary has been voted by Catholic guardians.

MR. FLAVIN: How would the right hon. Gentleman like to have to live on £130 a year?

[No Answer was returned.]

Irish Agricultural Department—Catholic Clerks of the Veterinary Branch.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state how many communications (giving dates) were received at the Merrion Street offices of the Agricultural Department, from the Catholic clerks of the veterinary branch since 1st April, 1900, in reference to their position; how many of these communications were registered as official documents, and on what dates were they respectively registered; and on what dates respectively were these communications replied to.

MR. WYNDHAM: Several communications have been received by the Department from temporary clerks formerly employed in the veterinary branch, and transferred to the new Department. Their religions are unknown to the Department. The communications were duly registered as official documents, and were duly answered. I have already replied to numerous Questions addressed to me respecting the position of these clerks. It would be subversive of official discipline, and opposed to precedent, to enter into details of the character suggested by the hon. Member, and I must decline, in the circumstances, to give the information he desires.

MR. DELANY: Why is this disability imposed by the Department?

MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member has no right to say any disability is imposed.

MR. DELANY: I am only suggesting what I am in a position to prove?

Labourers (Ireland) Act—Cost of Registration of Title.

MR. O'SHEE (Waterford, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, in the case of lands acquired in fee under the Labourers (Ireland) Act, the Local Government Board issued a circular or letter to rural sanitary authorities, calling their attention to the desirability of having the title to the plots registered under the Local Registration of Title (Ireland) Act, 1891; and whether, seeing that the average cost of registering the title to each plot is between £5 and £6, he will consider legislation with a view to providing for free registration of the title to these plots as of holdings purchased under the Land Purchase Acts.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have ascertained that no circular of the character mentioned has been issued by the Local Government Board, the Land Commission, or the Registrar of Titles. The maximum fees payable in the Registry of Titles in respect of any such registration as that referred to amount to 13s. only.

The Anglo-French Convention.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury when it is proposed to exchange the ratifications of the Convention between England and France of 8th April, 1904, relative to Newfoundland, the Gambia, the Isles de Los, the Niger, and Lake Chad; in case the Convention should not be ratified, will the stipulations it contains in Articles IV. to VIII. as to the Gambia, the Isles de Los, the Niger, and Lake Chad becomes inoperative as well as the stipulations in Articles I. to III. as to Newfoundland; and have any steps been, or are any being, taken to carry out the Articles IV. to VIII.

The following Questions also appeared on the Paper—

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury are the two Declarations, one respecting Egypt and Morocco and the other concerning Siam, Madagascar, and the New Hebrides, essential parts of the Agreement with France represented by those two Declarations and by the Convention of 8th April, 1904, relating to Newfoundland, the Gambia, and the Niger; and is it understood between His Majesty's Government and the French Government that the two Declarations will retain their effect and be carried into execution even in case the Convention fails to be ratified.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, have the Government of Newfoundland made any representation to His Majesty's Government or raised any difficulties affecting the rights conceded to the French under Article II. of the Anglo-French Convention of 8th April, 1904, in respect of Newfoundland local regulations as to bait, fishing, or access to ports on the so-called French shore, or in respect of the policing of the fishing; and was any agreement come to by His Majesty's Government with the Government of Newfoundland on these points before the Convention was signed.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): Perhaps my hon. friend will be good enough to postpone, say for ten days, any Question upon this subject. I do not think it would be in the public interest that I should at this moment give a reply by way of Question and Answer across the floor of the House.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Does that refer to all my Questions?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes; they all relate, more or less directly, to the Anglo-French Agreement, and I am inclined to think that it would be desirable, if my hon. friend sees no objection, to defer them for the time I have suggested.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES assented to the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman, but added that, in view of the extreme gravity of the situation that might arise, he would put the Questions down again a fortnight hence.

Labourers (Ireland) Act Amendment Bill.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury what course the Government intend to take with reference to the Irish Labourers Bill; and whether they have considered the desirability of referring the Bill to one of the Grand Committees.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I see no objection to referring the Irish Labourers Bill to one of the Grand Committees in the present condition of public business.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Will the right hon. Gentleman adopt that course.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes, Sir, I will?

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): To which Committee will it be sent?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am afraid I cannot answer that, nor is it necessary I should do so at the present moment, but the information will be forthcoming when the Motion is made.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Until the Aliens Bill is disposed of, it is undesirable to send this Bill to the Grand Committee on Law.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Of course, the condition of business in the Grand Committees must be one of the governing considerations in determining to which Committee the Bill should be sent.

Budget Proposals affecting Stripped Tobacco.

MR. CHARLES McARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, having regard to the disorganisation of the tobacco trade and almost complete cessation of dealings in stripped tobacco, as shown by monthly circulars, by reason of proposed fiscal changes, he can expedite the resumption of the debate on the Budget proposals affecting tobacco.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am as well aware as my hon. friend of the inconveniences which have resulted from the postponement of the Budget. I hope to take it on the first complete Parliamentary day on which we do not take the present stage of the Licensing Bill.

Committee of National Defence.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury in what capacity and for what reason did Lord Curzon attend and take part in the proceedings of the Committee of the Cabinet for National Defence; and whether there is any, and, if so, what, precedent for a gentleman without special naval and military experience, who is not a member of the Cabinet, taking part in the proceedings of a Committee of the Cabinet or of the Cabinet as a whole.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The Committee of Defence have the right, and I think a most valuable right, to summon to their councils anybody whom they think will assist them in their deliberations.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Did Lord Curzon attend as Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No.

Passive Resisters.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he will hold an inquiry by Royal Commission or otherwise into the grievances of the 22,000 ratepayers who have refused to pay rates under the Education Acts of 1902 and 1903; and, if not, will he say what course he intends adopting to remove the grievances of those who object conscientiously to the provisions of these Acts.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have never been able to understand that there were any grievances.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES: It is well known that there are grievances, so I press for a further reply.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is not known to me.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES: May I ask what action will be taken with respect to the 22,000 ratepayers who have refused to pay the rates—putting aside the question whether or not they have a grievance.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I suppose that rests with the rating authorities.

The Operations in Tibet.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Government has received any information this morning with reference to the operations in Tibet.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Perhaps my hon. friend will put down a Question to my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for India, who is not now in his place.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): But is there not important news to-day which the House should have?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think the right hon. Gentleman will agree with me that to ask me, without notice, at five minutes to 3 o'clock, and in the absence of my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for India, to give the House an account of events in Tibet, is a bit unreasonable. If I had had the smallest notice that such a Question was going to be asked I should have brought down the necessary documents.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I thought it was not unusual, except in matters involving complicated negotiations, to ask a Question without notice on incidents occurring from day to day.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I did not bring down the telegram, but if I had been told, even ten minutes ago, that a Question was going to be asked, I would have sent for it. But it so happens that a right hon. friend of mine has got it, and I see no reason why I should not read it to the House. But of course I could not be expected to bring it down, and I think that to repeat from memory a telegram of such a character would be setting a very evil precedent. The telegram is as follows—

"Younghusband reports that to-day he sent two messengers to Tibetans that signal gun would be fired at 12 o'clock, and that if fort was not surrendered firing would commence at

12.30. The delegates—Tongsa Penlop and Ta Lama—women and children were warned to leave fort. No notice was taken by Tibetans there, and at 12.38 firing on the fort commenced."

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): I beg to ask the right hon. Gentleman what Votes will be taken to-morrow and Thursday in next week, as well as the business for Friday.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Irish Estimates will be taken to-morrow, the Votes being those for the Land Commission, the Board of Works, and the Chief Secretary's salary. Under any circumstances the Chief Secretary's salary will be the first Order at the evening sitting. In response to the earnest request made to me by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Somerset, Friday will not be an allotted day to the Licensing Bill, and I therefore propose to take the Irish Land Bill and the reference to a Grand Committee of the Irish Labourers Bill.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: I presume the reference of the Labourers Bill will be the first Order?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: There is probably a good deal to be said in favour of that.

Mr. WILLIAM MOORE (Antrim, N.): As the Labourers Bill is likely to be bitterly opposed by hon. Gentlemen on this side of the House, will the right hon. Gentleman put that second Order.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR was understood to express a hope that the opposition would not be of undue length.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: As to the Cunard agreement?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I am not yet able to make any statement as to the debate on the Cunard agreement.

ACCESS TO AND FROM THE HOUSE.

Mr. LOUIS SINCLAIR (Essex, Romford) said he desired to draw the attention of the Speaker to Sessional Order No. 11, and to ask him to interpret and clearly define the meaning of it.

***Mr. SPEAKER**: I am not called upon to give interpretations of the Sessional Orders unless an occasion arises. The hon. Member must first show that he is raising some question of privilege or Order.

Mr. LOUIS SINCLAIR said he was raising a question of privilege on Sessional Order No. 11. That Order was as follows—

> "Ordered, that the Commissioners of the Police of the Metropolis do take care that, during the session of Parliament, the passages through the streets leading to this House be kept free and open, and that no obstruction be permitted to hinder the passage of Members to and from this House"

He was proceeding from that House to his home on 12th May, and on the near side of the road in Regent-street the roadway was entirely obstructed by a hose, making it impossible for him to proceed on the near side of the road without either going over the hose or waiting until the obstruction was removed. He thereupon drove on the off side of the road, and as soon as possible returned to the near side. When he stated the case to the magistrate as a question of privilege, the magistrate dismissed the question of the Sessional Order, saying, "We all know what that means." He desired to know whether hon. Members were allowed to exercise that privilege conferred by the Sessional Order, and to what distance the privilege extended from the Houses of Parliament. This was the first time he had ever been fined; he would have waited until the obstruction was removed rather than go on the wrong side of the road, if he had not believed that he was within his rights and could have free access to and from the House. He claimed that privilege as a Member of that House and as a law-abiding citizen.

***Mr. SPEAKER**: I think the House will agree with me that it would have been better, perhaps, if the hon. Member had kept on the right side of the road. I do not think the House will expect me to leave this to them as a question of privilege; it seems to be an ordinary police case. Wherever the line is to be drawn under this Standing Order, it does not extend to an indefinite distance from the Houses of Parliament—there must be some limits to it—and I think that, in the ordinary sense of the words, an hon. Member driving up Regent Street about an hour after the House had risen could scarcely expect to come within the operation of the Order.

MR. LOUIS SINCLAIR said he had not, perhaps, made himself clear. Mr. Speaker said that he ought to have waited or gone on the right side of the road; but he could not because it was obstructed.

*MR. SPEAKER: I only referred to what the hon. Member had said, that, finding he could not keep on the right side he went on the wrong side, relying on this Order. I said that I thought it would have been better if he had kept to the right side instead of relying upon the Order.

LICENSING BILL [1ST ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 1:—

Amendment again proposed—

"In page 1, line 9, after the words last inserted, to insert the words 'except in county boroughs.'"—*Sir James Woodhouse.*

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR JAMES WOODHOUSE (Huddersfield): I have to ask leave to withdraw this Amendment in view of the promise of the Solicitor-General to consider this question.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

SIR ROBERT REID (Dumfries Burghs) moved an Amendment with the object of allowing the magistrates to take into consideration not one isolated reason for non-renewal of a licence, but a combination of reasons, as they had hitherto done. He said it was desirable to retain unimpaired the elasticity of discretion which the magistrates now possessed, and he wanted to insure that in future they should be able to take into consideration not one isolated reason for non-renewal but a combination of reasons. Obviously it weakened the power of the magistrates to insist on the maintenance of good order to split their discretion up into water-tight compartments.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 9, after the words last inserted, to insert the words 'or any of the before-mentioned grounds in combination with any other ground.'"—(*Sir Robert Reid.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL (Sir EDWARD CARSON, Dublin University) said the Government could not accept the Amendment. It would be very unfair to the licence-holder to tell him that his licence was being taken away partly on grounds for which he ought to get compensation and partly on grounds for which he ought not to get compensation, and that, therefore, he would get no compensation. It was impossible under the scheme of the Bill that such an arrangement could be set up.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) suggested that the Amendment might be modified so that no grounds outside those contained in the Bill should be brought in. That would go some way to meet the strong feeling on his side of the House. The point was this. There might not be strong enough evidence on any one single ground to justify the refusal of the renewal, yet the evidence on these grounds combined might suffice for taking away a licence without compensation. All they desired was to enable the magistrates to deal with the three grounds in combination.

SIR EDWARD CARSON said there was nothing to prevent the magistrates from taking one, two, or three grounds and putting them together, but these grounds ought, in fact, to exist; they ought not to be able] to add together three incomplete grounds in order to make one complete ground.

SIR ROBERT REID said the result of the clause was to entirely alter the practice of the past. A house might have been bad structurally or the tenant might have misconducted it, but there had been hitherto a free discretion on the part of the magistrates in dealing with such cases and by the refusal of this Amendment the existing practice would be subverted.

MR. WHITTAKER (Yorkshire, W.R., Spen Valley) said this was a very important point, and it was necessary the country should know what was being done. Justices at present very frequently refused the renewal of a licence on several grounds, and the combination of grounds was the ground of refusal. The Government's attitude was an illustration of the way in which the power of the justices was going to be materially limited, hampered, and checked. In his opinion the compensation should be limited to the cases where the renewal was refused solely because the house was not required.

MR. GROVES (Salford, S.) hoped the Government would not give way on this point. If the licence-holder committed offences the magistrates would be able to exercise their powers as in the past; it was only to the point of compensation that the provision under discussion was directed. If the Amendment were accepted, they would, he feared, find that in nine cases out of ten trivial complaints would be combined in the manner suggested in order to depreciate the amount of compensation.

MR. TOMKINSON (Cheshire, Crewe) said he had in his mind a case that came before the Bench of which he was chairman, in which the representative of the sanitary authority objected to the renewal of a licence on the ground that the holder had persistently refused to provide a proper water supply. The justices, in the exercise of the power which they at present possessed, gave the licensee a certain time within which to remedy the defect. He was contumacious, and it was only when, as a last resource, the withdrawal of the licence was threatened that he agreed to equip his house with a proper water supply. He feared that under the clause as it stood the power to exercise such pressure would be taken away from the justices.

SIR EDWARD CARSON assured the hon. Gentleman that the case he had mentioned would not come within the Bill.

SIR ARTHUR BIGNOLD (Wick Burghs) stated that during the past year only 210 licences, out of a total of 99,450, were suppressed for duplicate reasons; and in only fifty cases was the ground of non-requirement united with misbehaviour or structural deficiency. He mentioned that in order to show that in the past these considerations had not acted very powerfully in deciding the question of the renewal or refusal of a licence.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.) pointed out that there was nothing compelling quarter sessions to adopt this compensation scheme. There might be large districts where they would decline to adopt it. In that case, was it possible that the Government were contemplating arresting the action of the magistrates and impairing their discretion where compensation did not arise at all?

SIR ROBERT REID: And without leaving anybody else in authority to exercise discretion.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: Yes. Continuing, the hon. Member said that the Government by refusing to accept this Amendment would be crippling the present power of the justices. The Government raised, in defence of that, that these people were entitled to compensation, and therefore they could not shut them out without depriving them of compensation. His point was this: Let them take an area, the quarter sessions of which would not put this Act into operation at all. Was it not quite clear that this Bill would stand nevertheless, and that it would cripple the present power of the justices. He knew that that was the object of the brewers; but why should it be the object of the Government?

SIR EDWARD CARSON replied that he did not know whether that was a proper way to put the question, but he was quite willing to answer the substance without admitting any of the deductions which the hon. Member had made. The Question which the hon. Member asked came to this: the quarter sessions might refuse to adopt the compensation clause. If they had an area not willing to take away licences, what did it matter whether they put in two, three, or four reasons?

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL: But you are taking power from the local justices who do think there ought to be a reduction.

Sir EDWARD CARSON said there, again, his hon. friend was entirely in error. Any licence-holder might appeal against a refusal to renew a licence.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL: I know.

Sir EDWARD CARSON, continuing, said, if a county had a body of quarter sessions who were not prepared to adopt the clause or reduce licences it would be because they thought it was not necessary to reduce them. At all events, if they had a tribunal of that kind with important functions, not merely in relation to licences but to other matters, they must show some confidence in them.

Lord EDMUND FITZMAURICE (Wiltshire, Cricklade) held that the Committee was justified in calling attention at the earliest possible moment to the extraordinary position in which Courts of the quarter sessions would be placed. It seemed to be suggested that they would have to meet beforehand to decide whether or not they would put the Act in force. As chairman of quarter sessions he was one of those who would have to administer the Act, and he was bound to say that their position would be totally different from that adumbrated by the Solicitor-General. In his opinion they would deal with each case as it arose and would not beforehand pass any resolution stating whether or not the Act should be enforced. But what would be the position if there were no compensation fund established? Would the justices not be in the ridiculous position of having their hands tied? The speech of the Solicitor-General would almost encourage quarter sessions to pass a resolution saying they did not approve of the Bill.

Sir EDWARD CARSON: The noble Lord has no right to say that.

Lord EDMUND FITZMAURICE said that the Bill, while setting up elaborate machinery for the establishment of a compensation fund, put in possession of the Court a power which, if it chose to exercise it, would absolutely nullify the measure. In any case, until the compensation fund grew, they would have the absurd state of things that in one county—a rich one—the Act would be in operation and in the next county—a poor one—it would be a dead letter.

*Mr. AUSTIN TAYLOR (Liverpool, East Toxteth) said the point was that there was a possibility under Clause 3, that quarter sessions might not put into operation the levy for the purposes of compensation, and if they declined to do that they would have no fund available for compensation for the refusal to renew redundant licences. But that difficulty might be met by making it incumbent on quarter sessions to raise a compensation fund. When that was done it would still be open to quarter sessions to refuse to confirm the decision of the justices in regard to any particular licence. The position of the justices would not be altered. At present their decisions were subject to appeal. He agreed with the right hon. Gentleman as to the vice from a temperance point of view of this particular clause. But they had debated it over and over again. The Government, by restricting the grounds upon which magistrates might refuse to renew licences to three—each of which he gathered from the Solicitor-General must be sufficient in itself as a ground of refusal—were most effectually crippling the powers of the magistrates with regard to the exercise of their magisterial discretion. It was impossible to accede to these compensation proposals without modifying in some way the absolute discretion of the magistrates, but he thought the difficulty might be met in the way suggested by the hon. Member for Carnarvon—by giving the magistrates power to make by-laws subject to an appeal to the Secretary of State. By that method the trade would be protected against the eccentricities of "cranky" Benches, to which the Prime Minister recentlyreferred. The discussion, however, was being carried on under the shadow of the guillotine, that most perfect instrument of Parliamentary despotism, of which neither political Party could claim an absolute majority. That being so, it was necessary to make the most of the time that remained, and not go over the same ground two or three times. He therefore hoped the Amendment would be withdrawn.

COLONEL PILKINGTON (Lancashire, Newton) was understood to urge that the word "shall" should be inserted when Clause 3 came to be discussed. Quarter sessions would no doubt do their duty but he thought it advisable that the raising of the compensation fund should be made compulsory.

SIR ROBERT REID, in order to save time, asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Leave refused.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 176; Noes, 255. (Division List, No. 200.)

AYES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Channing, Francis Alston
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, CharlesRamsay(Galw'y
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, CaptEC(SAndrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans,SirFrancisH.(Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flynn, James Chritsopher
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale
Harcourt, RtHnSirW(Monm'th
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol,E.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, SirJosephF.(Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh, N.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Connor, James (Wicklow,W.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Kelly, James(Roscommon,N
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Philipps, John Wynford
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely,Maj.J.E.B.(Isle of Wight
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Sheehy, David

Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, DavidAlfred(Merthyr)
Thomas, JA(Glamorgan,Gower
Tillet, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Fred. W.(Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wood, James
Woodhouse, SirJ.T(Hudd'rsfi'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Ellis Griffith and Mr. T. W. Russell.

NOES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hon.Sir H
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt.Hon. A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, RtHnGerald W.(Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Bowles, Lt.-Col.H.F(Middlesex
Bowles, T. Gibson (King'sLynn
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Campbell, Rt.Hn.J.A.(Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Chamberlain,RtHnJ.A.(Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Rt.Hon.Sir John C.R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig, Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.
Crean, Eugene
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, W. Bromley
Davies, SirHoratioD.(Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland,SirFredDixon
Dorington, Rt.Hon.Sir JohnE.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt Hon.Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Doulgas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fergusson, RtHn Sir J.(Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster,Philip S.(Warwick, S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon,Hn. J.E.(Elgin & Nairn
Gordon,Maj Evans (T'r H'mlets
Gore, Hon S. F.Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene,HenryD.(Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Marq.of (L'donderry
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton(Tynem'th)
Harris,Dr. Fredk. R. (Dulwich)
Heath, James (Staffords.N.W.)
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse,RtHnH.(Somers't,E
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(SheffieldBrightside
Horner, Frederick William
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Midd.,Tottenham)
Hozier, Hon.JamesHenry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Kennaway, Rt.Hn.Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo.T.(Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Kerr, John
Kimber, Henry
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, JohnGrant(YorksNR.
Lee, Arthur H.(Hants.Fareham
Legge, Col.Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Iver,SirLewis(Edinburgh,W.
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell,RtHn.Sir H.E (Wigt'n
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Moore, William
Morgan, DavidJ(Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)

Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nolan, Col.JohnP.(Galway,N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary,Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Dowd, John
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Peel, Hn.Wm.RobertWellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, S. Forde (BethnalGreen
Ritchie, Rt.Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir Harry S (Limehouse
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, SirH.(Renfrew)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Smith, HC(North'mb.Tyneside
Stanley, Edward Jas.(Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon.Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, SirMarkJM'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col.SirCEH(Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E.(Taunton
Welby, SirCharlesG.E.(Notts.
Wharton, Rt.Hon.John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton undLyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A.Stanley (York,E.R.)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H.(Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt.Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Young, Samuel
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

MR. McKENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) moved to leave out of lines 9, and 10, after the word "licence," the words "shall be vested in quarter sessions instead of the justices of the licensing district." The effect of this Amendment would be to leave the control of the licences in the hands of the justices as at present. In every case the justices had local knowledge of the district over which they exercised jurisdiction, and their work on the whole had been satisfactory. There had been no recommendation in either of the Reports of the Royal Commission in favour of transferring the work of the justices to quarter sessions. What was proposed in the Bill was to remove the control from an administrative body and hand it over to the quarter sessions, who, according to the wording of the Act, were to act as a legal tribunal. If this proposal were adopted the real control over licences would be very much diminished, and all the elements of discretion would disappear. It was not necessary for him to quote the cases upon the authority of which it was established that quarter sessions now acted as a Court of Appeal. The justices were not a Court at all, and it was a very grave question of principle whether the control of licensing should be handed over from an administrative body to a Court of Law. There was an Amendment further down on the Paper which provided that quarter sessions should act as an administrative body, but it did not appear to be absolutely necessary that the Court of quarter sessions should be substituted for the licensing justices at all. He was aware that, inasmuch as the area of subscription to the compensation fund was considered to be at least of a size commensurate with the quarter sessions jurisdiction, it was thought, therefore, that the Court of quarter sessions should be the controlling authority and not the licensing justices, whose area of subscription would be very much smaller. That difficulty could very easily be met. The Court of quarter sessions might easily allot the amount of money to be used as compensation within the area of the particular justices' brewster sessions, and it was not necessary to transfer the whole of the licensing powers from the justices to quarter sessions. If quarter sessions had power of limiting the amount of compensation in any particular area it would be perfectly possible to leave the actual control of each licence to the licensing justices. He admitted that quarter sessions must be introduced if they were to have the area of quarter sessions as the area of subscription for the compensation fund. No doubt in certain cases the area over which the licensing justices had jurisdiction would be too small to provide adequate funds, but it was quite possible for the quarter sessions to determine what the proper amount was for each area of the licensing justices and allot that sum, and then the licensing justices should have jurisdiction in determining whether a licence should be discontinued or not. The proposal of the Government was to hand over the control of the licences from men who were thoroughly acquainted with the district to a body of gentlemen sitting at quarter sessions who were not, who could not know what were the particular requirements in the remote parts of the county, would be acting without the necessary local knowledge, and would be certain to discharge their duties less efficiently than would be done by the local justices. If the Government could not accept this Amendment in its present form, they might at least introduce words in order to leave unchecked the present jurisdiction of the licensing justices in their own area. If that were done, the Government would remove one of the most serious objections to the Bill, namely, that the justices who had hitherto done their work extremely well should not have withdrawn from them work which they had every reason to believe they would be able to continue to do thoroughly well. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 9, to leave out from the words last inserted to the word 'shall' in line 10."—(*Mr. McKenna.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'shall' stand part of the clause."

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's) said the hon. Member desired to leave the decision in regard to the taking away of licences in the hands of the local justices. He had already anticipated the objection of the Government, which was that the authority which dealt with the compensation fund should be the authority to deal with the licences to be refused. The hon. Member urged that a certain amount of money should be allotted to each brewster sessions' area to compensate licence-holders in cases where licences were refused on the ground of public policy. He submitted that that course would not be at all reasonable or desirable. It would not work in practice. There would be some brewster sessions' areas where no, or a very small number of, reductions would be made; there would be others where the number would be considerable. The result would be very unequal distribution of the benefits of the Bill. Therefore, he thought it would be far better that the trust should be vested in quarter sessions, and that they should be the authority. He believed there would be a much more even distribution in that way of the reduction of licences all over the county.

LORD EDMUND FITZMAURICE said that, apart from the objections which had been so forcibly urged by his hon. friend, quarter sessions were a most unfortunate body to commit this jurisdiction to, because, since 1888, quarter sessions had not been an administrative body at all. Although technically, as had been pointed out, this was a judicial duty, still the matter was an administrative one. He asked the Home Secretary what staff quarter sessions had at the present moment in order to carry out these duties. Since 1888 their staff had consisted of the clerk of the peace and perhaps an officer to maintain order in Court when quarter sessions were sitting. Therefore, one objection, in addition to those already stated by the mover of the Amendment, he had to the proposal in the Bill was that quarter sessions would be compelled to take up administrative duties and appoint an administrative staff. That was a new venture and one which he ventured to think was most objectionable.

MR. BRIGG (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley) said the machinery of quarter sessions had entirely gone out of use for collecting and distributing money in the way proposed in the Bill. The West Riding Sessions, with which he was most intimately associated, had passed a resolution to the effect that they did not see that they could possibly make use of the machinery now provided for this purpose and suggested that the county council was the proper body to be called upon to collect the money, while they themselves would deal, under the Bill, with the money so gathered. In order to perform the duties now to be placed upon them, it would be necessary to appoint a number of officials. He had an Amendment on the Paper that these duties should be carried out by the joint committee. He was sure that the quarter sessions could not deal with the work proposed to be committed to them with the staff they now had.

Mr. CRIPPS (Lancashire, Stretford) asked, on a point of order, if it would be open to the Committee on subsequent Amendments to discuss whether quarter sessions, or some other body, were to be the authority.

The CHAIRMAN: The point raised by this Amendment is that the authority is to remain as it is now. If the House does not think so, it is still open to the House to suggest any other authority—the standing joint committee, a committee of quarter sessions, or quarter sessions themselves. This will not affect the further Amendments.

Mr. CRIPPS said the present body was peculiarly unsuitable to be the authority on account of the area in which they acted being so small. That had been the great difficulty in carrying out any effective scheme of licensing reform. They could not carry out any effective scheme in a small area. In the county with which he was associated they did try to carry out a scheme of temperance reform, and they could have done it over the county at large, but they found they could not do it by dealing only with district areas. In order to carry out this Bill effectively, it was necessary to have a county scheme so that the whole county might be properly dealt with. He thought the Bill did not give sufficient power to the county authority. They ought to give the county authority, as against the smaller authority, power to do something definite in order to carry out a scheme which would do the best for temperance reform. It was important to have suitable administrative areas in which the magistrates might effectively carry out temperance reform.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 250; Noes, 182. (Division List No. 201.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Bowles, Lt.-Col. H F (Middlesex
Bowles, T. Gibbon (King's Lynn
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A (Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J A (Worc.
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Rt. Hon. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Crean, Eugene
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott,
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Doogan, P. C.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W)
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Gordon, Maj Evans (T'r H'mlets

Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Marqof(L'nd'nderry
Hardy, Laurence(KentAshford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton(Tynem'th)
Harris, Dr. Fredk.R. (Dulwich)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, James (Staffords. N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, RtHnH(Somers't,E
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hon. James HenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Kennaway, Rt. Hon.SirJohnH.
Kenyon, Hon.Geo. T.(Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Kerr, John
Kimber, Henry
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson,JohnGrant(Yorks.N.R.
Lee, Arthur H.(Hants.Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt.Hn. Walter (Bristol,S
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M‘Fadden, Edward
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (EdinburghW
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn W. F.
Maxwell,RtHnSirH.E. (Wigt'n
Maxwell,W.J.H (Dumfriesshire
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu,Hon.J.Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Moore, William
Moran, David J (Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nolan, Col. J. P. (Galway, N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary,N.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Peel,Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, S. Forde (BethnalGreen
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas.Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel,Sir Harry S.(Limehouse
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H (Renfrew)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Smith,H.C(North'mb, Tyneside
Spear, John Ward
Stanley,Edward J. (Somerset)
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M‘Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J G (Oxf'dUniv.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.SirC.E.H (Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col. ACE (Taunton)
Welby, Sir Charles G E.(Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H.(Ashton-und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York,E.R.)
Wilson-Todd,SirW.H.(Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Young, Samuel
Younger, William

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt. Hn. HerbertHenry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Channing, Francis Allston
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)

Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin,CharlesRamsay(Galway
Dilke, Rt. Hon, Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice,Capt.EC(S.Andrw'sBghs
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Ellis, John Edward (Notts)
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans,SirFrancisH (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert J.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hain, Edward
Harcourt,Lewis V.(Rossendale
Harcourt,RtHnSirW (Monm'th
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mitchell,Edw.(Fermanagh, N.)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien,Kendal (TipperaryMid
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Kelly,James (Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Philipps, John Wynford
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Reid,Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely,Maj.JEB (Isle of Wight
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen,E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas,DavidAlfred (Merthyr
Thomas,J.A(Glamorgan,Gower
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton,JohnLawson(Leeds S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason,JohnCathcart (Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.)
Wilson,Fred.W.(Norfolk, Mid.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wood, James
Woodhouse,SirJ.T.(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. M'Kenna and Mr. Lambert.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH (Anglesey) said he wished to move an Amendment which concerned the county areas, and which he hoped would be taken into consideration by the Solicitor-General and the Home Secretary. He was not going to traverse the ground already gone over as to the disqualifications of the quarter sessions, but he submitted that the alternative he suggested was better than the one contained in the Bill as it now stood. As the Committee were aware, the joint police committee was elected—half by the quarter sessions, and half by the county council. It was a pretty well-known fact that in England and Wales the very best magistrates were selected to sit on the joint police committee; and he believed that most of the county council members of that committee were themselves magistrates. The joint police committee had the control of the police, and he submitted that it would be a most convenient thing that that committee should have control of the licences throughout the county areas. He had reason to believe that his Amendment commended itself to the whole body of moderate men on both sides of the House. The Amendment, he thought, would do something to remove the objection to this part of the Bill which transferred the licensing authority from the local justices to the quarter sessions

The quarter sessions were often a very large body which had necessarily no local knowledge of many parts of the county, and it was admitted that the justices were chosen very much at haphazard by the Lord Chancellor. He was told that members of quarter sessions had been whipped up often on both sides when the granting or refusal of a particular licence was coming up for decision. All these difficulties would be removed by his Amendment. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 9, after the word 'shall' to insert the words 'in county areas.'"—(*Mr. Ellis Griffith.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there insertea."

SIR EDWARD CARSON said that there were many reasons for retaining the jurisdiction proposed in the Bill. They had framed the Bill so as to interfere as little as possible with the existing procedure. Every alteration was solely due to the necessity of having a larger compensation area. In cases where, for non-requirement or for other reasons, the brewster sessions came to the conclusion that a licence ought to be taken away, they were, under the Bill, to make an order referring the question to the quarter sessions with their report; whereas, under the old system the licence-holder had a direct appeal to quarter sessions. That was the only difference. The reason why the matter had not been allowed to remain exactly as it was, was that the area of compensation furnished by the ordinary licensing district of brewster sessions would be too small. That being so, was it not better to keep the quarter sessions and the form of procedure as nearly as possible as it was, than to set up a new tribunal which would have jurisdiction only in cases where compensation was concerned. In other words, they would have in every county, the quarter sessions seized of one part of this appellant jurisdiction, and the standing committee seized of another part of it. There was another question raised by this proposal, namely, the question of admitting a representative element in relation to the administration of the compensation fund. If the fund were a public fund subscribed out of the rates, or was in any way a county charge, it might be argued that there ought to be representation; but, of course, this fund was no such thing. It was a charge on one particular trade to enable them to insure against their licences being refused. He had always understood that the objection to this particular clause was that it interfered with the justices; but justices would be interfered with more by setting up a standing joint committee than by retaining quarter sessions. The Amendment, as far as he understood it, would also change what was proposed as regarded county boroughs, because it would take away from the whole body of the justices there the right to administer the fund in their own districts. That would be a great pity. In giving that power to justices in county boroughs he thought the Government were setting up the proper tribunal for administering this fund; and the reason why county boroughs were treated in this way was because they provided a sufficient compensation area. He was, therefore, unable to accept the Amendment.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 178; Noes, 265. (Division List No. 202).

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Aherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)

Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, CaptEC(S Andrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans, SirFrancisH (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert J.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hn. Sir E. (Berwick
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hain, Edward
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale
Harcourt, RtHnSirW(Monm'th
Harwood, George
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Hobhouse, RtHnH. (Somers't, E
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Jordan, Jeremiah

Joyce, Michael
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, SirJoseph F(Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh, N.)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen(
Morpeth, Viscount
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal(Tipperary Mid
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John

Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely, Maj. JEB (Isle of Wight)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, DavidAlfred (Merthyr
Thomas, JA (Glamorgan Gower
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton, J. Lawson (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene(Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk Mid.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York. W.R.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wood, James
Woodhouse, SirJT (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Ellis Griffith and Mr. Dalziel.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. SirH.
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r

Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W(Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Lt.-Col. H.F (Middlesex
Bowles, T. Gibson (King'sLynn
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.

Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. JA (Gasgow)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, RtHn J.A. (Worc.
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E
Coddington, Sir William

Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Rt. Hn. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S
Crean, Eugene
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Doogan, P. C.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn. J E (Elgin & Nairn)
Gordon, Maj Evans (T'rH'mlets
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nderry
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R. Dulwich)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, James (Staffords. N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.)
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred.
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir J. H.
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Kerr, John
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks. N.R.
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E. (Wigt'n
Maxwell, W. J. H (Dumfriesshire
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Moore, William
Morgan David J. (Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Dowd, John
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Peel Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharpe
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy

Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)

Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir Harry S. (Limehouse
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H. (Renfrew)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Smith H C. (North'mb. Tyneside
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John

Talbot Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tuffnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward

Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E H (Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)

Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Young, Samuel
Younger William

Tellers for the Noes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.) said the object of the Amendment he now proposed to move was to secure that no change in the machinery with regard to licensing administration should take place except on the condition that quarter sessions decided to levy the annual charge referred to in Sub-section 1, Clause 3, of the Bill. The root principle of this Bill was to attempt to reduce licences throughout the country, but that, in the view of the Government, could not be adequately or justly done without payment of compensation. The Government had made it clear that there would have been no need for any change in regard to licensing jurisdiction had it not been necessary to have a compensation fund of this character for the benefit of those who lost their licences on the sole ground of non-requirement. The Government had more than once asserted that it was not their desire to interfere in any way with the jurisdiction of the local licensing justices, but that if it was absolutely necessary to set up a compensation fund then it was necessary for quarter sessions to decide the question of non-renewals on the ground of non-necessity. That being so, what possible ground could there be for any interference with the present powers of jurisdiction of the local justices unless quarter sessions decided to set up a compensation fund? It was admitted that there was an inconvenience with regard to the double jurisdiction and there were undoubtedly serious disadvantages connected with it. He urged this Amendment on the practical ground that above all things it was desirable that every kind of stimulus should be provided for uniformity of action throughout the country in regard to the setting up of this fund. It was perfectly plain that unless every quarter sessions decided to levy the fund the fund would be hopelessly inadequate to bring about any reduction of licences throughout the country. On these grounds he begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 9, after the word 'shall,' to insert the words 'in the event of quarter sessions deciding to impose in respect of all on-licences within their area the charges referred to in Section 3, Sub-section (1), of the Act.'"—(*Mr. Herbert Roberts.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir EDWARD CARSON said with regard to this Amendment he had nothing to add to what he had already said on a previous Amendment of a similar character. He asked what reason was there to suppose that quarter sessions would refuse to carry out their duty when this Bill was passed, any more than they refused to carry it out now. The whole argument in favour of this Amendment appeared to be that they were to assume that quarter sessions, when this Bill was passed, would refuse to administer the law. Did not the hon. Member who moved the Amendment see that if quarter sessions did not set up a compensation fund what it involved? Quarter sessions would at some time have to say, "We will not do our duty in the renewal of licences." They could not segregate the two cases. Directly quarter sessions refused to set up a compensation fund they abrogated all their functions under the Bill. If the Amendment were passed it would be necessary to go further and abolish quarter sessions altogether, because they might decide to set up the fund, but charge the minimum instead of the maximum rates, and thus defeat the purpose of the fund. It they were wicked enough to do the one thing they were bad enough to do the other. There was really no ground for treating quarter sessions in this way, they had always transacted their business properly, and there was no reason to suppose that they would adopt a different course in the future.

Mr. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe) pointed out that, inasmuch as the municipal authorities were losing their rights, there would be no reduction of licences whatever if the quarter sessions refused to act. It was only reasonable that this provision should be made compulsory. The local justices were most in touch with local opinion, but there was nothing in the Bill to give effect to the recommendation of both Reports of the Royal Commission that local opinion should be consulted. The Commission recommended that the licensing authority should be a combination of the justices and elected persons from the town council, but there was no provision of that kind in the Bill. As the powers of the borough justices were to be taken away, the county justices ought to be compelled to do something on the recommendation of the local magistrates. His experience as a borough magistrate had not been such as to satisfy him that the county justices would take the necessary steps without pressure. He hoped, therefore, the Government would not refuse the concession asked for by this Amendment.

Mr. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.) said the conditions under which the discussion was being carried on did not admit of anything like free or adequate debate, but the matter raised by the present Amendment was of so much urgency, and the grounds on which the hon. Member had rested his case were so strong, that he thought the Government might give it a little more consideration. The proposal of the Amendment was that the jurisdiction at present possessed by the licensing justices should be retained by them unless quarter sessions, to which that jurisdiction was by this Bill to be transferred, resolved to set up this fund. He entirely demurred to the suggestion of the Solicitor-General that the quarter sessions would be guilty of any neglect of duty if they refused to raise the fund. In some counties it was in the highest degree probable that quarter sessions would not think it worth while to do so. In consequence of the smallness of the area involved the fund would be wholly inadequate to effect any substantial reduction of licences, and quarter sessions might very reasonably say that they would have nothing whatever to do with the matter. What would be the position then? The power of the licensing justices would have been taken away, and in its place a nugatory power given to quarter sessions; therefore in those counties the whole thing would be hung up, and there would be no authority in a position to exercise a jurisdiction which everybody admitted to be necessary. A more reasonable Amendment had not, in his opinion, been proposed in the whole course of the discussion.

Sir EDWARD CARSON said the argument of the right hon. and learned Gentleman would be all very well if the local authorities had an absolute power to refuse licences, but they had no such power, as the last word already lay with quarter sessions. He regretted that the right hon. Gentleman should have said that quarter sessions would be able to ignore the Bill. But if any quarter sessions were in that frame of mind, if this Amendment were carried how many licences were they likely to do away with on the appeal of the local justices? The same matters would be operative with them, and would render the provision nugatory.

Mr. DISRAELI (Cheshire, Altrincham) did not believe the quarter sessions of a single English county would refuse to take this matter up and act. Quarter sessions throughout the country had long desired to do something in the way of the reduction of licences, but they had not possessed the power. They were now to have the power, and it was not likely that any body of English gentlemen would refuse to exercise it.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 176; Noes, 267. (Division List No. 203.)

AYES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth, C. B.
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William

Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Capt EC(S.Andrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans, SirFrancisH.(Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T.(Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone, Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hn. Sir E.(Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hain, Edward
Harcourt, Lewis V.(Rossendale
Harcourt, RtHnSirW(Monm'th
Harwood, George
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese SirJosephF.(Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh,N.)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal (TipperaryMid
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Kelly, James(Roscommon,N
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Reid, Sir R. Threshie(Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spear, John Ward
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, DavidAlfred(Merthyr)
Thomas, J A(Glamorgan,Gower
Tillet, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philip
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton, JohnLawson(Leeds,S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wood, James
Woodhouse SirJ.T(Hudd'rsfi'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Mr. Herbert Roberts and
Mr. Shackleton.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher Rt.Hon. SirH
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Rt HnGeraldW.(Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T.(Windsor)
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Lt.Col.H.F.(Middlesex
Bowles, T. Gibson (King'sLynn
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell,Rt.Hn.J.A.(Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, RtHnJ.A.(Worc.
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham

Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Rt.Hon.SirJohnC.R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig, Chas. Curtis(Antrim,S.)
Crean, Eugene
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd(Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Davies, SirHoratioD.(Chatham
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt .Hn. Sir JosephC
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, SirFredDixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon.SirJohnE.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt.Hon.SirWilliamHart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B.(Hants,W.)
Fergusson Rt.Hn.SirJ.(Manc
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay,Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, SirRobertPenrose-
Fitzroy, Hon.EdwardAlgernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster,Philip S.(Warwick,S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon,Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn)
Gordon,MajEvans-(T'rH'mlets
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir JohnEldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, HenryD.(Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq.of(L'donderry
Hardy Laurence(Kent,Ahford)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton(Tynem'th
Harris Dr. Fredk. R.(Dulwich)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, James(Staffords.,N.W.)
Heaton, John Henniker

Helder, Augustus
Henderson, SirA.(Stafford,W.)
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse,Rt.HnH(Somers't,E
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J.(Midd.,Tottenham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. SirJohn H.
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T.(Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col.W.(Salop.
Kerr, John
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson,JohnGrant(Yorks.N.R
Lee, ArthurH(Hants.Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long Col. Chas.W.(Evesham)
Long Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Iver,SirLewis(Edinburgh,W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W.F.
Maxwell, RtHn.SirH.E(Wigt'n
Maxwell, W.J.H(Dumfriesshire
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Moore, William
Morgan DavidJ.(Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nolan, Col.JohnP.(Galway,N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)

O'Brien, P. J.(Tipperary, N.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Peel,Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, S.Forde(BethnalGreen
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel SirHarryS.(Limehouse
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Snarpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, SirH.(Renfrew)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Smith, HC(North'mb Tyneside
Stanley, EdwardJas.(Somerset)
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord(Lancs
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col.SirC.EH(Sheffield
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.Col. .C.E.(Taunton
Welby, SirCharlesG.E.(Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley,H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley(York,E.R.)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H.(Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm

Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson	Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.	TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B.Stuart-	Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong	Sir Alexander Acland-Hood
Wrightson, Sir Thomas	Young, Samuel	and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George	Younger, William	

MR. J. H. LEWIS (Flint Boroughs) said the object of his Amendment was to give quarter sessions the option of remaining outside the scope of the Act altogether, and that was a totally different question to the one which had just been decided. His proposal would enable quarter sessions, in cases where they considered it desirable, to wait in order that they might see how the Act operated in other counties. They all knew that at the commencement of an Act of this kind administrative mistakes were constantly made, and the various authorities gained by each other's experience. He thought it was desirable that there should be a certain amount of local option. Some countries were much more highly licensed than others, and some had not such a large proportion of licences. What they were doing by this Bill was to absolutely close every possible door by which any sort of different administration could be carried out as an experiment in different districts in the future. Surely the experience of their Colonies, and of Norway, Sweden, and the United States, supplied them with a sufficient number of precedents to work upon. They were by this measure making any sort of licensing reforms impossible except upon the lines suggested by this Bill. He particularly asked that in the Welsh counties they should have in the future some chance of settling this question in their own way, and on their own lines. If Courts of quarter sessions in Wales, knowing the feelings of the Welsh people, should decide that it would be better to defer putting the Act into operation in order to see whether some better method could be found, which would promote temperance reform, he suggested that some liberty should be given to those Courts to adopt that course. The fact that there was no time limit in the Bill made an Amendment of this kind all the more necessary. Had there been a time limit they might have looked forward to some change of a beneficial character not altogether upon the lines of this Bill. He urged that the Government should give some measure of local option to the counties in order that some of the counties might keep outside the sphere of this Bill, and thus give Parliament an opportunity of perhaps settling the question in a different way in the future. For the reasons he had given he hoped the Government would see their way to accept the Amendment he had proposed.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 9, after the word 'shall,' to insert the words, 'when quarter sessions so determine.'"—(*Mr. J. H. Lewis.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS said the object of the hon. Member's Amendment was to wait to see how the Bill operated in neighbouring counties; and he also desired that there should be a general local option in regard to the Act altogether. The Government thought the Bill was for the general benefit of the public and he saw no reason why the principle laid down should not apply all round. On these grounds he could not agree to the Amendment.

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON (Leith Burghs) said that after his experience on the Licensing Bench he was quite certain that justices would object to the alteration proposed in the Bill. It would be entirely against the public interest and there would be considerable feeling on the part of many licensing justices against putting the Bill in operation. They should have the option as the Amendment proposed to remain on their present footing and not adopt the Bill. The Home Secretary had stated that the Bill was one to reduce licences and that that was a good thing. He admitted that was a good thing, but it certainly was not a more important section of licensing reform than some others. There were half-a-dozen objects of even greater importance than the mere reduction of licences, and, keen as he was himself for restricting the excessive use of liquor, he was certain that this was not a Bill which should be put in operation by a Bench that had the power of effecting reforms in the liquor traffic in other ways. This was a vicious Bill and the local justices should have the power of not adopting it.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.) said it was only fair that the opinion of the local justices should receive some attention in regard to a Bill of this sort, which they had to administer. The spirit of local option which the Amendment proposed to introduce into the Bill already obtained in regard to the Education Act. It was a spirit which had been found on the whole to make Acts of Parliament work fairly. Whether this Bill was good or bad was outside the question now before the Committee. The magistrate who disapproved of the measure would always be loth to administer it. Yet as a matter of fact Licensing Benches would have, after all, to put the Act into operation. That being so, some power of discrimination in this matter should be left to the licensing justices. Quarter sessions were supposed to know the conditions of a whole county over which they administered justice, and on the whole it was a fair contention that, knowing those conditions, they would be in a better position than the House to apply the Bill. For this reason the elasticity provided for by the Amendment should be put into the Bill.

MR. J. H. LEWIS regretted that the Government could not see their way to make a concession on this point, and all the more so because some of the counties were so extremely large that quarter sessions might reasonably consider that they could not take over the powers of the local justices which were given to them by this Bill, and that they would prefer to see how the experiment worked in other parts of the country. In his own county it was variously estimated that it would take between eighty and 100 years to get the number of licences down to the same level as in the adjoining county of Merioneth. In the course of the debate it had been mentioned that the average cost of a licence would be £800. He believed that was the figure given officially in a pamphlet written on behalf of the trade. Quarter sessions might reasonably say: "We will see whether some better means of reducing licences cannot be got than this, and in the meantime we will collect experience from all parts of the country." If the right hon. Gentleman would not accept the Amendment he would be bound to press it to a division.

MR. JOHNSON (Gateshead) said he believed it was desirable that local justices should have the option, in connection with this Bill, of waiting to get some experience before adopting it. He regretted that the Government had not accepted the Amendment. It appeared to him that the Government were not only determined to make no concessions whatever, but that this Bill was to be put through by sheer force, and that the smallest attempts on the Opposition side of the House to minimise its drastic effects were to be absolutely ignored. He hoped that some concessions which would be likely to make the Bill workable would be granted. Surely the local justices were the best able to judge whether the Bill should be put in operation or not. But it appeared to him no discretion was to be given, even to the Courts of quarter sessions, and that they must adopt and carry out the Bill at all hazards.

MR. WHITLEY said his hon. friend was quite correct in appealing to the analogy of the Education Bill. The great mistake which was made in connection with the Education Bill, and which was having a disastrous effect all over the country at the present moment, was that the areas were too big for any single body to deal with. The Government had already acknowledged their mistake in that respect by adopting smaller areas under the Scotch Education Bill. In the Bill now before the Committee they proposed to have a body which would rest on the advice of officials. The Amendment proposed that power should be left to quarter sessions to divide their administrative areas into districts, and to delegate their duties in that way.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton) said that, after all, they wanted to give local authorities some option as to what they should do, as they knew what they were fitted for. A protest was made in Devonshire against being saddled with the duties of the Education Act, and now the cost of administration had gone up enormously without any increased efficiency. Who was to pay for the increased staff consequent on the Licensing Bill? He was certain the ratepayers in his county would strongly object. The Government thought the county was a sort of divine area. A county could do no wrong, but anything less than a county area was hopeless. If a county was fitted to carry out the duties surely it was fitted to know whether it should carry them out or not. These were entirely novel proposals and he would ask the Government to give some elasticity to county bodies as to what they should put in force. Owing to the drastic proposals of the Government he did not know what this Bill really proposed to do. Supposing the county justices did not put the Bill in force, were there any compulsory powers provided to compel them to put it in force? He might be told that that question would arise later on, but it might be wiped out by closure by compartments. The Amendment of his hon. friend was perfectly conciliatory, and if the Government were not proof against accepting any suggestion for the improvements of the Bill, which he was afraid they were, he hoped they would give a favourable ear to his hon. friend's proposal. If not, it would only be another case of the extravagant inefficiency caused by this scheme of the Government, which meant something like centralisation gone mad. If they were met with a blank refusal by the Government they could, of course, only support their opinion in the Division Lobby.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 116; Noes, 271. (Division List No. 204.)

AYES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Asquith, Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Benn, John Williams
Boland, John
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan)
Delany, William
Devlin, Charles Ramsay (Galway
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Dunn, Sir William
Elibank, Master of
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Hain, Edward
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Rt Hn Sir W (Monm'th
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire)
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lundon, W.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh, N.)
Murphy, John
Newnes, Sir George
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Reddy, M.
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rigg, Richard
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roche, John
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomas J A (Glamorgan Gower)
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson, Charles Henry (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wood, James
Woodhouse, Sir J.T. (Hudd'rsf'd

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Herbert Lewis and Mr. John Johnson.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. SirH.
Austin, Sir John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J.(Manch'r)
Balfour,RtHn.Gerald W.(Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry.
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, T.Gibson (King'sLynn)
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell,RtHn. J.A. (Glasgow)
Carson, R. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W.(Derbyshire)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain,RtHn J.A.(Worc.
Chamberlayne, T.(S'thampton)
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Rt. Hn. Sir John C. R.
Colston,Chas. Edw. H.(Athole.)
Cox, Irwin Edw. Bainbridge
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Crean, Eugene
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies,Sir HoratioD.(Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale,Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland,Sir FredDixon
Doogan, P. C.
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers

Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants,W.
Fergusson, Rt Hn Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster,Philip S.(Warwick,S.W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon,Hn.J.E. (Elgin & Nairn
Gordon,Maj.Evans (T'rH'mlets
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq.of(L'donderry
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R. (Dulwich
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford,W.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse,RtHn.H (Somers't,E
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J. F. (Sheffield,Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain HerbertMerton
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kennaway,Rt.Hn.Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Kerr, John
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour

Knowles, Sir Lees
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks. N.R.
Lee,Arthur H.(Hants.,Fareh'm
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W.(Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol,S
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas,Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring,Hn.W.F.
Maxwell,RtHn Sir H.E.(Wig'tn
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Moore, William
Morgan, David J.(Walth'stow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray,Rt.Hn.A.Graham(Bute
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway,N.
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Peel, Hn.Wm.RobertWellesley
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley,S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hn.Chas.Thomson
Roberts, Samuel Sheffield
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke

Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir Harry S(Limehouse
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Smith,H.C.(North'mb.Tyneside
Smith, James Parker(Lanarks:
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hon.Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas.(Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.SirC.E.H.(Sheffield
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col. A.C.E(Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. G.(Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley,H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson-Todd, SirW.H. (Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Young, Samuel
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.) said that the object of his Amendment was to secure that there should be some provision for a systematic report and inquiry by the justices in each licensing district as regarded public-houses for the guidance of quarter sessions. The consequential part of the Amendment appeared on page twenty-eight of the Amendment Paper. He considered that under the scheme of the Bill it was necessary to transfer those powers from the licensing justices to the quarter sessions; but they should be careful, in doing that, not to unnecessarily weaken the power of the licensing justices. There was no new duty imposed under this Bill on the licensing justices to take any survey of the public-houses in their district and to decide which of them ought to be shut up and which ought to be continued. The great object of this Bill, as they were constantly informed by the Government, was to make a large reduction in the number of public-houses; and it was because of that consideration that many of them voted for the Second Reading. But, unless there was some further provision, that would not be done in all cases. In saying that he did not wish to cast any slur on quarter sessions, of the honour of which the Solicitor-General was so justly jealous. He had no doubt they would do their duty; but that duty would be to deal from time to time with the individual cases referred to them. Quarter sessions would have no initiative; and he contended that the only way in which quarter sessions could get a comprehensive view of the conditions, and exercise any intelligent discrimination as to what public-houses should be shut, was to provide within the four corners of the Bill for a proper and systematic inquiry by the justices in every licensing district, who were the people best acquainted with the facts. It was most important that quarter sessions before they proceeded to administer the compensation fund should have a comprehensive report such as he proposed. Otherwise, there would be certain to be great irregularity, which would be undesirable. There ought to be a proper and systematic report. He had an Amendment further on to provide that the justices of every licensing district should, at their general licensing sessions, or an adjournment thereof, to be held in the year 1905, and in every third subsequent year, inquire into the needs of their district and the number and character of the licensed houses therein, and should make a report to quarter sessions stating the particular on-licences (if any) which in their opinion ought not to be renewed, and any circumstances affecting such licences or the holder thereof which might be material to the renewal or to the value of such licences. If that could be secured, then, and only then, would quarter sessions be able to take a comprehensive view of their duties and decide what was best in the interests of temperance. He did not insist on the exact words of the Amendment; but he hoped the Government would insert an Amendment to carry out his object.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 9, after the word 'shall' to insert the words 'subject to the provisions of this section for inquiry and report by licensing justices.'"—(*Mr. Henry Hobhouse.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR EDWARD CARSON said that any Amendment moved by his right hon. friend would naturally receive the fullest consideration from the Government. He was not sure, however, that he quite understood the Amendment except in a general way. He understood it to mean that quarter sessions should every three years take a full survey of the whole situation. What was to follow? If they had to wait until this survey was made every three years in order to see what action should be taken, this would mean a revolution in the present annual system. At present there was annual revision, which, he submitted, was a much better system, for it enabled the licensing authorities to carry out the wishes of the justices in each district as far as they were agreed. He could not see, therefore, what was to be gained by changing the system. The Amendment gave quarter sessions powers of initiation which they did not now possess, and he thought that the annual revision was preferable. The point he did not understand was what action would be taken in the interval between the triennial periods.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE said that there was nothing in his Amendment to prevent a report in any year.

SIR EDWARD CARSON said it would be open to the justices to take a survey at any period, and report to quarter sessions. He did not really think anything would be gained by the Amendment. They did not intend to interfere with the licensing justices further than was necessitated by the principles of compensation. It would be impossible, without changing the whole licensing law, to take away the annual revision; and there would be no difficulty in the licensing justices surveying their districts and reporting to quarter sessions. He had not the least objection to confer with the right hon. Gentleman. This was a matter which did not go to the principle of the Bill and he would have pleasure in meeting his hon. friend, if he could, by drafting an Amendment which would carry out the object he desired. He might say that there was a similar Amendment further down on the Paper in the name of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Ripon, which he was prepared to accept, which had in view that the progress of quarter sessions should be steadily kept under review. That seemed to him to be an important Amendment, keeping strictly in view what was being done, and an Amendment which he was prepared to accept. So far as the wording of this Amendment was concerned, while he did not say an Amendment of this character ought not to be accepted, it gave greater power of control to quarter sessions, and that being so he could not accept it.

MR. CRIPPS said, though they were grateful to the Solicitor-General for what he had said, that he could not help thinking the hon. and learned Gentleman had not entirely apprehended what this Amendment sought to do. The underlying idea was to obtain a triennial or annual review, of the licences of each district. He agreed that it should be an annual review but that was a detail which did not go to the basis of the Amendment. In order that the county authority should do its best and make the best of the compensation fund, it would be necessary to work on what might be called a county scheme. They had to see what had to be done in the county area in order to see how the fund could be worked to the best advantage, and how could a county scheme be arrived at without making the county authority the initiating authority for this reform? What his right hon. friend proposed by his Amendment was not to interfere with the main principle but to so modify it as to obtain the knowledge of the local authority, so as to enable the county authority to use the compensation fund to the best advantage, and he proposed to do so by asking the local Bench of each district to send are port to the county authority of the needs of the district. If that were done the county authority would be able to get out a good county scheme because they would have the local knowledge which every one desired they should have. Instead of having to rely on a chance objection made by an individual they would be able to ask each particular bench of magistrates to draw out the scheme which they thought best for administering the Bill in their own particular district. When the local justices had done that the county authority could act on the full information coming from these local authorities and the fund would be allocated to its true purpose. He asked the Solicitor-General, therefore, to say that, if a scheme could be evolved which would at once preserve the power of the licensing magistrates of the district and at the same time ensure that the quarter sessions had proper information to deal with the fund in the best possible manner under a county scheme, an Amendment should be introduced to bring together those two desirable objects. Every one interested in this licensing question would agree that this would be a great administrative reform and that it would enable this Bill to be carried out in a broad and at the same time a most economical manner. On these grounds he supported the Amendment.

*Mr. DUKE (Plymouth) said he hoped the Solicitor-General would introduce some words into the Bill to give effect to the principle of the Amendment of his right hon. friend. The Bill as it stood was incomplete without the acceptance of some such Amendment as that. The Solicitor-General had assumed that there was at the licensing sessions at the present time a review of licences with a view of ascertaining where licences were redundant.

Sir EDWARD CARSON: I say they have the power.

*Mr. DUKE said he had no doubt of that, but what he desired was that they should not only have the power, but that they should also be reminded of their duty. If words were not put in to impress upon the justices the necessity of considering whether there were, or were not, redundant licences in their district, this Bill would fail in its object. All that was desired by the hon. Member for East Somersetshire was that some words should be introduced which would make it the duty of the licensing justices, either annually or at some other period of time, to consider whether there were in the district redundant licences and what ought to be done with those licences The concession which the Government had made with regard to the imposition upon quarter sessions of the duty of reporting to the Home Secretary was the strongest possible argument in favour of putting upon the licensing justices the duty of reporting to the quarter sessions.

*Mr. TALBOT (Oxford University) said he desired to support the Amendment, but from a different point of view from that of the mover of it. What he hoped would result from this discussion was that that stimulus would be applied to the local justices which, notwithstanding what had been said as to their extreme energy, was requisite looking to the infirmities of human nature. As the general desire was to remove all redundant licences it must be made not only permissible for the local justices to remove them, but a stimulus must be applied to ensure that they should do so. It was for the reason that he desired to see the stimulus applied that he supported the Amendment.

Mr. PEEL (Manchester, S.) asked whether, in view of the strong feeling on the Government side of the House that something in the direction of the Amendment should be carried out, the Solicitor-General would undertake to introduce a clause. If the matter were postponed to the Report stage, there might, in consequence of the arrangement of new clauses, be some difficulty.

Sir EDWARD CARSON was not sure that he yet understood the object of the Amendment. It appeared to be an attempt to enlarge the power of quarter sessions. Under the Bill the licensing justices were the persons to select the houses to be sent up to quarter sessions. They were bound to do that each year.

Mr. DUKE pointed out that there was no obligation in the Bill.

SIR EDWARD CARSON said that neither was there any obligation upon the licensing justices now. This was a new complaint. Hitherto the point he had had to meet was that the Government were taking away powers of the licensing justices, but the case here was different. If the selection was left to the licensing justices, how, by sending up a report to quarter sessions, could they effect anything unless the initiation was left to quarter sessions? He did not think the Amendment was necessary, but if the object was to make it clear that it was for brewster sessions to select the cases and for quarter sessions to say whether they agreed or disagreed, he was quite willing to try to meet that view. Under the Bill quarter sessions would have a report from, and a consultation with, the licensing justices, and he failed to see what further assistance in coming to a conclusion would be given by the Amendment. There was also the question of expense. If each year the licensing justices were to send up a report, not merely of the houses which they suggested should be taken away in that year, but of all redundant houses, leaving it to quarter sessions to make a selection, not only would that be a greater infringement upon the rights of the licensing justices than the Bill now made, but it would be necessary for every person interested in each one of those houses to appear annually before quarter sessions, although probably less than one-tenth of the houses would be dealt with in any particular year. That would be almost a prohibitive matter from the point of view of expense. If it was thought to be any advantage that the local magistrates should make the same annual report to the Home Office, and that that Department should distribute it to quarter sessions, he was willing to include that in the Amendment he had promised.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE said he was afraid that would not meet the case. His object was that quarter sessions should have from each district not only a report as to the particular houses which were proper subjects for immediate action, but full information as to the other houses which it would be advisable to get rid of in the future, so that they should not dissipate all their money at once. He was sure that was an object which the Government could secure if they liked. This subject would not be discussed on Report owing to the very stringent rules which had been laid down, and he was very much afraid that a mere conference would not produce that effect which would cause the suggestion to be accepted.

* MR. TALBOT said that after hearing what the Solicitor-General had said he was thoroughly satisfied. He was of opinion that these powers which the justices had possessed had not always been operative forces in the country, and he thought it would require a considerable amount of pressure on the local justices to make sure that they would put this provision into operation. The Solicitor-General had promised to provide that it should be the duty of the licensing justices to report to the Home Office what they had done under the Act, and probably that would give that stimulus to putting the Act into operation which he desired.

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR said he did not know whether his right hon. and learned friend appreciated the fact that this Bill gave no stimulus whatever to the licensing justices to take a survey of the needs of the district every year. Clause 2 provided that the licensing justices were to report on the question of the renewal of any particular on-licences. A concrete illustration of what had happened in Liverpool was valuable as a forecast of what was likely to happen under this Bill. In Liverpool they took a number of areas where the property had been demolished, and year by year they considered the redundancy of licences in those areas. After extinguishing a number of licences in any particular area they did not trouble that district again for some time, and possibly would not touch any more licences in that district for many years. That was a illustration of how this Bill ought to work if any good was really going to be done. His hon. friend had stated that in the past some benches of magistrates had been too active while others had not been active enough. What he desired was to give the necessary stimulus to the licensing justices to bring their efforts up to the requirements of temperance reform by directing them to take a survey of the whole needs of the area.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 192; Noes, 251. (Division List No.205.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt.Hn.HerbertHenry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Bill, Charles
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan)
Delany, William
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Capt. E. C. (SAndrw'sBghs
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans, Sir Fran. H. (Maidstone)
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. HerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hain, Edward
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale)
Harcourt, RtHn Sir W(Monm't)
Harwood, George
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (Accrington)
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morpeth, Viscount
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Newnes, Sir George
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roche, John
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Shackleton, Davin James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spear, John Ward
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, J. Cathcart (Orkney)
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Henry Hobhouse and Mr. Austin Taylor.

Mr. Austin Taylor.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Austin, Sir John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J.(Manch'r)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour,Rt.HnGeraldW.(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T.(Windsor)
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hn. St. John
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell,Rt.Hn.J.A.(Glasgow
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish,V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain,RtHn J.A.(Worc.
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cohrane, Hon. Thos. H.A.E.
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Colomb,Rt.Hon.Sir John C.R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig, Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.
Crean, Eugene
Cross,Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies,Sir Horatio D.(Chatham
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt.Hon.Sir JosephC.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland,SirFred Dixon
Doogan, P. C.
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund R. (Hants, W.)
Fergusson,Rt.Hn.SirJ.(Manc'r)
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald,Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy,Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S.(Warwick,S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gordon,Hn.J.E.(Elgin & Nairn
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton,Marq.of(L'nd'nderry
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris,F. Leverton (Tynem'th)
Harris,Dr.Fredk. R. (Dulwich)
Heath,Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords.N.W.)
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson,SirA.(Stafford,W.)
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham)
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kenyon,Hn. Geo.T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law,Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks. N.R.
Lee, ArthurH.(Hants.,Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col.CharlesW.(Evesham)
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas,ReginaldJ (Portsmouth)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Iver,SirLewis(Edinb'rgh,W.)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell,RtHnSirH.E (Wigt'n
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hn. J.Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan,DavidJ (Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray,Rt Hn.A.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nolan, Col. J. P. (Galway, N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Dowd, John
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley,S.Forde(Bethnal Green
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, SirHarryS.(Limehouse
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.

Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H. (Sheffield
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Taunton
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Young, Samuel
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.) said he did not propose to move the Amendment standing in his name. He thought it was desirable to support the Amendment to be proposed by the hon. Member for Huddersfield.

*SIR JAMES WOODHOUSE said he wished to move in line 9 of Clause 1, after "in," to insert "a committee, one-half of whom in every case shall be elected by the justices of the licensing district from their own number, and one-half by the county council from their own number." He said that this Amendment raised the question of the introduction of some representative element in the constitution of the authority which would have to deal with licences. He was fortified in submitting the Amendment by the fact that the principle received the support of both the Majority and Minority Reports of the Royal Commission. He also claimed that the Scottish Act of last year contained precisely the same suggestion he was making. What was good for Scotland ought to be good for England. Apart from that, the introduction of the representative principle was thoroughly justified by the fact that the ratepayers had to pay for the consequences of intemperance in the shape of increased police rates and poor rates and all the consequences that flowed from the excessive use of intoxicating drinks. The ordinary principle of self-government, namely, that what the ratepayers had to pay for they ought to have some right to control, should be observed in this matter. As long ago as 1835 the House of Commons sanctioned that principle, when the Municipal Reform Act of that year was under discussion, by a large majority. The House of Lords rejected the proposal, but the view of the House of Commons was that the whole question of licences should be placed in the hands of municipal corporations. Further, the Conservative Government, when the Local Government Act was being considered in the year 1888, proposed to give a committee of the county council power to deal with licences, so that he had these precedents in support of his Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 9, to leave out from the word 'in,' to the word 'but,' in line 10, and insert the words 'a committee, one-half of whom in every case shall be elected by the justices of the licensing district from their own number, and one-half by the county council from their own number.'"—(*Sir James Woodhouse.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'quarter sessions' stand part of the clause."

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (MR. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.) said that the Government were unable to accept the Amendment. The hon. Member had referred to what took place in 1888, when the Conservative Government proposed to make a committee of the county council the authority to administer licences; but the authority of 1888 was based on different principles from those which they were now proposing; although he admitted now proposing; although he admitted that if the proposal of the Government of 1888 had been accepted a great many of the existing difficulties would not have arisen. The Amendment was wholly at variance with the principle followed in drafting the Bill, which had been to make as little change as possible in the existing system and to leave the decision to a judicial body. There were differences of administration in counties and boroughs, but as closely as possible the

Bill kept to the existing system. The Amendment would mean a radical change in the existing system, and such was not intended. Really the changes made by the Bill in the licensing system would be small; if the justices refused a renewal of a licence to an applicant, the ultimate decision would rest with the quarter sessions as a judicial body.

Sir **JAMES WOODHOUSE**: That would not apply to county boroughs.

Mr. **WALTER LONG**: There were points of difference in administration between the county boroughs and the county councils. The Government had endeavoured to keep as nearly as possible to the existing system, and to leave to the magistrates the decision of the matters in question. The proposal of the hon. Gentleman would involve a complete change in the existing system, because instead of these cases being referred to quarter sessions they would be referred to a committee, half of whom would be elected by the licensing justices and half by the county council. They proposed to give to the body in which the power now rested the right to say what licence should not be renewed and the exercise of that right accompanied by compensation to be provided by the trade itself. The Amendment would be a radical departure from the proposals in the Bill; and he, therefore, hoped the Committee would not accept it.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 245; Noes, 151. (Division List, No. 206.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Austin, Sir John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc.
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Crean, Eugene
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmuna B. (Hants, W.)
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'derry
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords. N.W.
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jameson, Majer J. Eustace
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Kerr, John
Kimber, Henry

King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks. N.R.
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M‘Fadden, Edward
M‘Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh, W.
M‘Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, Rt. Hn. Sir H. E. (Wigt'n
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Mesey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, David J. (Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir Harry S. (Limehouse
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M‘Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H (Sheffield
Walker, Col. William Hall
Welby, Lt.-Col A. C. E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Young, Samuel
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Frederick
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Capt E C (S Andrw's Bghs)
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hn. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Rt Hn Sir W (Monm'th
Harwood, George
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H, (Bristol, E.)
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W.
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.)

Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Loyd-George, David
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh, N.)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Newnes, Sir George
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Philipps, John Wynford
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roche, John
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Spear, John Ward
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wood, James

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Channing and Mr. Charles Allen

*Mr. DUKE said he had been astonished, not to say dismayed, to hear the President of the Local Government Board assume as a fact that the quarter sessions in discharging the duties to be discharged under this Bill would act as a judicial body. Everyone conversant with the duties of quarter sessions would know that they had two separate and distinct sets of duties, one of them administrative and the other judicial. There was no difficulty in distinguishing between the administrative duties which had devolved on justices by the practice of centuries and the operation of Acts of Parliament and their judicial duties which were of quite a different character. It was essential that Parliament should decide whether the duties devolving on quarter sessions through this Bill, which was an administrative measure, should be performed by quarter sessions as a judicial or an administrative body. He submitted that these administrative duties should be performed by quarter sessions as an administrative body.

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

LICENSING BILL [1st Allotted Day].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. Lowther (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 1:—

*Mr. DUKE, continuing his speech, contended that if the Bill were examined it would be seen that it was impossible that it could have ever been intended that it was to be administered on judicial principles; there was no contest, and the whole matter was one of administration. There could be no judicial decisions, no parties and no dispute which required a tribunal or procedure to deal with them on judicial lines. He asked the Government to consider whether there were not some means by which they could define the powers which the justices were to exercise. If some were to be judicial let them be selected and declared to be powers to be administered judicially. But having regard to the fact that the major part of these powers were purely administrative powers, he asked the Government to make the matter clear in the Act. If they did not make it clear that the whole of the powers were administrative and were to be exercised with the freedom with which administrative powers were exercised by administrative bodies in this country, at any rate let them declare what the judicial powers were and leave the local authority free to administer the administrative powers. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 9, after the word 'sessions,' to insert the words 'acting as an administrative body.'"—(*Mr. Duke.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir EDWARD CARSON said so far as he could see this discussion was purely of an academic nature. There was no doubt that many of the duties to be performed were purely of an administrative character. It could be gathered from the Bill, without setting out the fact, that quarter sessions was acting as an administrative body. His hon. and learned friend was correct in saying that many of the duties of quarter sessions under this Bill would be administrative. Licensing and setting up the compensation fund were purely matters of administration, but there were other duties cast on quarter sessions by this Bill which could not be described as other than judicial. In all cases of appeal from the licensing justices and in all matters specified in the first sub-section they would act judicially. A licence-holder who was refused a renewal might appeal to quarter sessions, and there again they would have to act in a judicial capacity. The licensing authorities might report that there were too many licensed houses in the district, and in that case a licence-holder whose licence was to be extinguished had a right to appeal to quarter sessions and say, "It is quite true that you say my licence ought to be taken away but I dispute that." Such a thing as that would constitute the very case which his hon. and learned friend said would necessitate a judicial decision, inasmuch as there would be a dispute between the parties. Quarter sessions were also entitled to hear other parties interested, which would include the justices who made the order. To draw a distinction between one set of cases in which they would be acting in a judicial capacity and another set of cases equally important, as leading to the same result, and to lay it down that in the latter they must act in a purely administrative character, would be a monstrous thing to do.

*Mr. DUKE asked the Solicitor-General would the quarter sessions administer the principles of law or doctrines of equity?

Sir EDWARD CARSON said they would administer both. The insertion of the words "acting as an administrative body" would leave it open to quarter sessions to say in regard to particular matters that although they had litigants and advocates before them and had to hear evidence, they, nevertheless, were not acting in a judicial capacity. The important thing was to know what duties were imposed, their nature, and how they were to be carried out. There would be no difficulty in determining, where necessary, when quarter sessions were acting judicially and when administratively.

Sir ALBERT ROLLIT (Islington, S.) noted the statements of the Solicitor-General that in accordance with the Act of 1902 the justices would still be heard upon these applications, and that in dealing with the personal and public rights involved there would be an opportunity for legal assistance, if necessary, in determining what were essentially judicial questions. He could not, however, follow the right hon. and learned Gentleman in his distinction between the administrative and judicial functions of quarter sessions. The appointment of the compensation fund provided not by the State or the public, but by the whole body of licence-holders themselves, the want of which had been one great obstacle to temperance reform, and the cessation of which, under a time limit, would, he felt as a magistrate, be a new and even greater impediment to such reform, which he heartily favoured, but for which personally he relied more upon education than upon legislation—was administrative; but the private question whether a licensee should or should not have his licence renewed, and the important public question whether the licence should or should not be renewed in the public interest owing to an excess of licensed houses in the district, was as clearly a matter of justice and to be judicially determined by the magistrates, who had always been bound, in law, not to act merely arbitrarily, but to exercise a real judicial discretion. The insertion of the words now proposed would be restrictive of the operation of the Bill. Two great questions would have to be dealt with judicially—first: Whether a licensee ought to be deprived of his licence on public grounds; and, secondly: Whether a particular house was required or not. In the former a private, and in the latter a public interest was concerned. The calculation of the compensation might be an administrative act, but it was merely a corollary of what quarter sessions must have previously determined judicially, viz., whether or not a licence should be renewed. The determination on the report of the local justices would frequently involve very important judicial considerations. As to the Bill derogating from the power of the local justices, he believed that a formal reasoned report, which would always be before quarter sessions, would have more influence and be more difficult to displace, because the onus of displacing it would be cast upon the virtual appellant. There ought to be in the future as there had been in the past a judicial determination of questions which were still really to be the subject of an automatic appeal. He hoped, therefore, the Bill would not be restricted by the insertion of the Amendment, which would restrict the duty owed towards both the publican and the public, each of whom were entitled to justice, and he noted from the speech of the Solicitor-General that the practice before the magistrates at brewster sessions would be maintained intact, and also that the parties interested and the local justices would still be entitled to legal assistance on such judicial points at quarter sessions, while in the county boroughs the abolition of any appeal to the quarter sessions for the county was an unquestionable concession to a long-standing grievance. Compensation, the fund for which might well have been made more adequate, and in which alone, and not in the licence, any vested interest was created, was the corollary of the refusal to renew, was thus administrative. but there was a previous question to be determined, renewal or non-renewal, and this was a judicial one from both points of view. But, it was contended, that the new practice would derogate from the powers and influence of the local justices. As to this, and as both a county and a borough magistrate, and a former legal practitioner in licensing cases on each side as to renewal or non-renewal and as to new licences, he respectfully but strongly differed. For, under the existing practice, the right of appeal from brewster to quarter sessions against non-renewal on the ground of excession of number of houses was absolute and practically always exercised. And the change proposed to be made in the case of such non-renewals was really an automatic appeal. With this difference, that the local justices, who, it had been legally decided, should not be represented on the appeal except under special circumstances, who were sometimes represented and sometimes not, and who, it was understood, would still retain any right to appear, and under the Act of 1902 would also be empowered to make a written and reasoned report to quarter sessions in every case of non-renewal on public grounds of excess of number of houses; and, whether the justices were represented or not, this report would always be read and largely referred to. Now, as a magistrate, he felt that such a report from a competent Court would receive more respect than any mere *ex parte* advocacy, inasmuch as it would be founded on local knowledge and experience, while it would be adjudicated upon by an independent judicial tribunal. It would, of course, be treated, as all such Court reports were by appeal tribunals, with respect, while it would have the effect, which advocacy on a rehearing never could have, of casting the onus of displacing it upon the party who impeached it, a legal consideration the importance of which any magistrate or practitioner would appreciate. And this was clearly not an administrative matter, but one which he himself and other magistrates, would always seek to determine as a judicial question and by the exercise of an impartial discretion, after hearing the justices' report, and that the parties, including the local magistrates, had to say upon it; and surely this was no reduction of such magistrates' powers, but, so far as it was more than an automatic equivalent of the existing absolute right of appeal to quarter sessions, rather an increase of power than otherwise. But all this was essentially judicial, not merely administrative, and such being the case he must oppose the Amendment of his hon. friend.

*Sir **JAMES WOODHOUSE** supported the Amendment, which he submitted clearly declared the law as laid down by the highest tribunals in the land—viz., that the determination of the question of the renewal of a licence, on the ground of non-requirement, was an administrative and not a judicial act. The only reason which had been avowed for vesting this duty in quarter sessions was that they were to dispense the compensation fund, but as an administrative and not as a judicial duty, so that no ground had been alleged for turning the tribunal of quarter sessions from an administrative into a judicial body in that sense. The report was to be sent from the licensing justices to the quarter sessions, not as a Court of Appeal, but as an authority who were to deal with it as an originating and determining body; and he submitted that there was a broad distinction between quarter sessions hearing an appeal, and determining a matter as an originating body with sole power to decide. The moment the question was considered in connection with a county borough the absurdity of the position became apparent. In county boroughs the whole body of justices, having no power to determine the matter themselves, would send it to a committee of their own members to decide finally, so that, according to the Solicitor-General, the whole body would be an administrative body, while the committee of the larger body would be a judicial body. Anybody who had had experience of the working of the licensing law would be compelled to agree with the hon. and learned Member for Plymouth.

Mr. **H. C. RICHARDS** (Finsbury, E.) agreed that there were times when quarter sessions had to act in an administrative capacity, but he thought the case which had been put forward demonstrated that when it was a question of dealing with the report of a committee, consisting practically of a minority of the magistrates of a county borough, they were bound to act in a judicial capacity. The hon. and learned Member for Plymouth had at any rate made out a case for a clear definition, although possibly the present was not the occasion upon which the Solicitor-General would prefer to give it. Quarter sessions had to determine the number of licences to be sacrificed, and they could not be said to be acting in a strictly judicial capacity until they had actually singled out the individual victims, and then every person interested ought to be heard.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 132; Noes, 124. (Division List No. 207.)

AYES.

Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Condon, Thomas Joseph

Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Delany, William
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellice,Capt. E C(S.Andrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)

Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harwood, George
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Higham, John Sharpe
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael

Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W.
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid Cornwall)
Leese Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morpeth, Viscount
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid.
O'Doherty, William
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Philipps, John Wynford
Power, Patrick Joseph
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries)
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John N. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roche, John
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomas, J. A. (Glamorgan, Gowe)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wood, James
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Duke and Sir James Woodhouse.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn J. A. (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Crean, Eugene
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fison, Frederick William
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Gore, Hn. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R. (Dulwich)
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Kerr, John
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks. N. R
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh, W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, Rt. Hn. Sir H. E (Wigt'n
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.)
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis

Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, David J. (Walthamstow
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt. Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Dowd, John
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir Harry S. (Limehouse
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Smith H. C (North'mb. Tyneside
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H. (Sheffield
Walker, Col. William Hall
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH moved to leave out the words "instead of" and insert "sitting with." According to the Bill the justices of the licensing district would have the position of a committee against whom there would be an appeal to quarter sessions. It might happen that the licensing justices declared by a large majority against a renewal, and their decision might be reversed by quarter sessions by a bare majority, and his object in providing that licensing justices should sit with quarter sessions upon the hearing of the appeal, was that the authorities having local knowledge should also have a voice in determining the question. He trusted that the Solicitor-General would, at any rate, be able to accept the substance of his Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 9, to leave out the words 'instead of,' and insert the words 'sitting with.'"—(*Mr. Ellis Griffith.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

SIR EDWARD CARSON said he could not accept the Amendment; it would be absolutely impossible that the justices of every licensing district should sit at quarter sessions. Licensing justices would, in fact, have great influence, for they would have the initiating power to bring about the withdrawal of a licence and quarter sessions would not. That a decision by quarter sessions might be given by a small majority was true, and the same thing happened in the High Court; he had recent experience of a decision being upset in the House of Lords by a majority of one. That had to be accepted and an exception could not be made in a case of this kind. The hon. and learned Member said that the licensing justices would have no voice in the matter; but he wished to point out that they would have a great voice because quarter sessions would have no initiative, and the licensing justices would have to select those licences which they thought ought not to be renewed. Therefore it was not quite accurate to say that they had no voice, and his hon. and learned friend would therefore see that the matter was not really so bad as he had made out.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 210; Noes, 128. (Division List No. 208.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds

Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, RtHn.J.A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Crean, Eugene
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, SirHoratioD.(Chatham
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt.Hn.Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn)
Gore, Hon. S.F.Ormsby-(Linc.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton,Marq of(L'nd'nderry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton(Tynem'th)
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R.(Dulwich)
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, RtHnH(Somers't,E
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.(Salop.
Kerr, John
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks., N.R.
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. CharlesW.(Evesham
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S..
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Iver,Sir Lewis(Edinburgh,W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, RtHn.SirH.E(Wigt'n
Maxwell, W.J.H. (Dumfriessh.
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan, Col.John P.(Galway,N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Dowd, John
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pease, HerbertPike(Darlington
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, S.Forde(Bethnal Green
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, SirHarryS.(Limehouse
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Smith,H C(North'mb.Tyneside
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Edward Jas.(Somerset
Stanley, Rt.Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.Sir C.E.H(Sheffield
Walker, Col. William Hall
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H.(Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel
Younger, William

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt.Hn.HerbertHenry
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry

Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Dobbie, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Dunn, Sir William
Ellice, Capt E.C(SAndrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Grant, Corrie
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harwood, George
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Higham, John Sharpe
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Doherty, William
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Malley, William
Parrott, William
Philipps, John Wynford
Power, Patrick Joseph
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roche, John
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomas, J A(Glamorgan, Gower
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Jn. Lawson(Leeds, S.)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wood, James
Woodhouse, Sir J.T(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Ellis Griffith and Mr. Edwards.

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON moved to leave out the word "but" in line 10, and to insert the word "and" with the object of ensuring that there should be a sufficient reduction of licences under the Bill and also to ensure that the public, to some extent, would get value for the rights which, in the opinion of many, they were called upon to relinquish under the Bill. The Solicitor-General informed the Committee yesterday that some of the Amendments were being moved in a perfunctory manner without sufficient reasons being given in their support. He was afraid that he would now be open to the same charge, because the point raised by the Amendment was a very large one. The reproach did not come very well from those who had taken steps to secure that it would be impossible to reason on many of the greater issues raised by this Bill. If time permitted, he believed a strong case could be made out for the Amendment he now proposed. In introducing the Bill, the Home Secretary said its object was the reduction of licences. The right hon. Gentleman said that was a good thing. Well, if this reduction was so necessary, why was it not to be compulsory? The impression of the Prime Minister was that the justices had been consumed with a desire to reduce licences unnecessarily throughout the country. His own experience was very different. He believed that the desire for conferring licences was, in many instances, a great deal keener than the desire to restrict them. The licensing authorities which had been least inclined to reduce licences had been quarter sessions. They might take as an example a division of the county to which he belonged. In the Island of Lewis the local justices had over and over again refused to renew licences, and the licences had always been restored by quarter sessions. He saw little security under this Bill of any large, general, or sufficient reduction of licences. Indeed, it offered obstacles to the reduction of licences, because many licences, which had no value at present, would be given a value, and the valuation scheme, by which it was proposed to make the value of licences as they stood at the passing of the Bill the basis of compensation, was, in his opinion, largely delusive. It would be found that they were raising, under this Bill, many financial obstacles to the reduction of licences. To make the reduction effective, he submitted that it should be compulsory. He did not regard the reduction of licences as the most essential branch of temperance reform. He looked upon the provision of counter attractions, which were wholly unprovided for in this Bill, and the maintenance of the control of the justices, as far more important than the mere reduction of licences, which to a large extent would be made more difficult under this Bill than it was now. There could be no difficulty in providing compulsory power under the Bill, because the hon. Baronet the Member for North-west Manchester, Lord Peel, and others suggested a scheme by which compulsion could be effected, and they recorded in the Minority Report that a great reduction of licences was a matter of the first importance, and that the redistribution of licensed houses should be safeguarded by a statutory maximum of say one on-licensed house to every 750 persons in a town population, and every 400 in a country population. Their view was that in seven years the number of on-licences should be reduced to that figure in England, and within five years in Scotland. The hon. Baronet knew that the distribution of licences in the North was much more approximate to this standard than it was in England. He wished the hon. Baronet had himself raised this point, and all the more because, although they had heard a great deal as to the support moderate men would be able to give to temperance reform, the course of this debate had shown how utterly ineffective their support had been in the discussions on the Bill. The object of the hon. Baronet was that at the end of seven years in England and five years in Scotland, the field should be left clear for legislative experiments by Parliament in the way of providing for the elimination of the element of profit in the liquor traffic, or any other method by which the liquor traffic could be more effectively controlled than at present. Besides that there should be absolute freedom for local communities to control the liquor traffic, either through local option or any other effective system of administration. Judging from his experience of the working of the present system he believed this Bill would form an effective check to the development of temperance reform schemes in the direction he had indicated. He believed that a compulsory reduction of licences would in some degree be a mitigation of the evils which would follow the passing of the Bill, and that it would be some security for leaving the way open for future experiments. It would also secure that the public would not have to pay a great deal more than they ought to. What the public were losing through this Bill was the rights in the monopoly which had been created by the public. That constituted to his mind confiscation of public property. He moved his Amendment, and would leave it to the judgment of the House.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 10, to leave out the word 'but,' and insert the word 'and.'"—(*Mr. Munro Ferguson.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'but' stand part of the clause.'"

SIR EDWARD CARSON said that the Amendment put from the Chair had no relation to the important question raised by the hon. Member opposite. The hon. Member had spoken on many points of great public importance, and had said that under this Bill the public were losing the benefit of a monopoly which belonged to them. If that were so, all he could say was that the public had been a very long time in trying to regain that monopoly. In his view the public would have a very much better chance of securing that monopoly on a proper basis when this Bill was passed, because it was practically admitted that during the last fifty or sixty years no progress had been made in the reduction of public-houses at all. The object of the Amendment was to lay down a fixed proportion of public-houses to population in every district in the country, and to do so in general terms. That was impossible, because the requirements of every district were absolutely different from those of other districts, and the hon. Member had the Report of the Commission against him. It appeared that the hon. Member also wished, in laying down his arbitrary statutory maximum or minimum, to provide an unlimited amount of compensation. His principle might be all very well if they were dealing with public funds, but was quite out of place when they were calling on the trade itself to supply the money for the insurance. He entirely disputed the suggestion that licences which had no value now would acquire a value by the passage of this Bill. They had put the clearest possible language into the Bill to prevent that.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield) said that according to a trade paper no one doubted that those who would have to pay this tax were the consumers of liquor.

MR. BOUSFIELD (Hackney, N.) said that the complaint of the hon. Member was that in this Bill no provision was made for what he spoke of as counter attractions to the public-house, and he seemed to regard that as of more importance than the reduction of licences. He himself had always held that view, and had preached it in vain to hon. Gentlemen opposite. When the hon. Member for Wolverhampton introduced his Parish Councils Bill he moved an Amendment that parish councils should have the power to provide parish rooms which would be a counter attraction to the public-houses, but that Amendment was refused. The object of the Amendment, as he gathered, was to secure a compulsory reduction in the number of licences. He himself had put on the Paper an Amendment with the object of making it the duty of magistrates to give attention to the number of public-houses in proportion to the requirements of the population. He hoped that the Government would give their attention to this matter, and would see whether they could not insert in the Bill some provision in the direction suggested in his Amendment.

MR. WHITTAKER said that if they were to pass a compensation scheme they should secure some substantial reduction of licences. But under the Bill there was no guarantee that there would be any reduction anywhere. It would be optional for the local justices to make a recommendation, optional for quarter sessions to accept the recommendation, and optional for quarter sessions to raise a fund. The object of this Amendment was to make it certain that there would be a reduction if the on-licences exceeded a certain number. The Amendment suggested a reasonable number in proportion to the population. In order to deal with the case of London it would be easy to institute a special class of licences for hotels, so that the ordinary drinking bar should be limited to some definite proportion. It was said that if this Amendment were adopted there would be an unlimited levy. There ought to be an unlimited levy. There ought to be power to make a levy in order to raise whatever amount of money was necessary to make the reduction that was deemed necessary.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 264; Noes, 167. (Division List No. 209.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G.W. (Leeds)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Lt.-Col. H. F (Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George

Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt.HnJ.A(Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig,CharlesCurtis(Antrim,S.)
Crean, Eugene
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross,Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies,Sir Horatio D.(Chatham
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt.Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Doogan, P. C.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt.Hn.Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants.,W.)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald,Sir Robert Penrose-
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gordon, Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn)
Gordon, Maj.Evans (T'r H'lets)
Gore, Hon. S.F.Ormsby-(Linc.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Greene, W.Raymond- (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton(Tynem'th)
Harris, Dr. Fredk.R. (Dulwich)
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heaton, John Henniker
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse,Rt.HnH(Somers't,E
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, Jn.(Kent, Faversham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T.(Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.(Salop)
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks., N.R.
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. CharlesW.(Evesham
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Iver,SirLewis(Edinburgh,W.
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
M'Killop W. (Sligo, North)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell,Rt Hn.SirH.E.(Wigt'n
Maxwell,W.J.H (Dumfriesshire
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Moore, William
Morgan DavidJ.(Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray,Rt.Hn.A.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nolan, Col. John P.(Galway,N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Dowd, John
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington
Peel,Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley,S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel,Sir Harry S.(Limehouse
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Smith,H.C(North'mb.Tyneside
Smith James Parker (Lanarks.)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hn.Arthur (Ormskirk)
Stanley,Edward Jas.(Somerset)
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.SirC.E.H.(Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby,Sir Charles G.E.(Notts.)
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd

Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne)
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel
Younger, William

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan)
Delany, William
Denny, Colonel
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellice, Capt. EC (S. Andrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hain, Edward
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale
Harwood, George
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W.
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid
O'Doherty, William
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Philipps, John Wynford
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomas, J. A (Glamorgan, Gower
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wood, James
Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Munro Ferguson and Mr. Herbert Lewis.

*Mr. ASQUITH: The Amendment which stands in the name of my hon. and learned friend the Member for Anglesey, and which I propose now to move, raises a question of interest and importance second to none in the whole Bill; it raises, in fact, the whole question of compensation. The Committee, I am sure, will not be surprised to hear that in submitting it I am embarrassed by the conditions under which I am compelled to speak. It is not as though I or anyone in this House was in the least degree entitled to complain of the time which has been occupied last night and this evening by previous Amendments. Point after point of the most serious importance has been barely and boldly stated to the House, and has been at once divided upon, without the advantage which, in Committee at any rate, we are accustomed to derive from the free play of informal, but not less useful, arguments across the floor of the House. A severe and, as some of my hon. friends would say, excessive self-restraint has been exercised. I am not at all sure that the results which have been achieved will be held to warrant its repetition. But at any rate, it is perfectly true that there has been no waste of time, no excess of talk, and no diversion of the attention of the House from serious and important to trivial and frivolous points. But when I approach this Amendment I cannot discuss it without considering its relation to, and its effect upon the remainder of this clause. What is the clause we are discussing? It contains twenty-two lines, of which we have discussed six. Upon the Order Paper at this moment there stand fifteen pages of Amendments, which I will not say remain for discussion, but which are to be ignored and passed aside without any discussion at all. They embrace some of the most important features of this Bill. But how am I, in the five minutes which are still to elapse before the guillotine falls, to say anything really useful or fruitful about that which is the vital and essential principle of this Bill? The provision in the lines which I have moved to omit, the provision which in future will restrain all power to refuse or reduce licences in conformity with the limited dimensions of a fund which will be small and exiguous, and in some parts of the country may not exist at all—this proposal, this far-reaching, deep-seated, and unprecedented revolution in the whole of our law of licensing is to pass now from this Committee unamended and even undiscussed. The procedure of the House of Commons is reduced to a farce. We are taking part in a parody of debate, and making ourselves accomplices in a caricature of the forms, and a betrayal of the spirit of Parliamentary institutions.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 10, to leave out from the word 'but' to the end of line 12."—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 279; Noes, 210. (Division List No 210.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Lt.-Col. H. F. (Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott

Dimsdale, Rt.Hn. Sir JosephC.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland,SirFred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson,Rt.Hn.Sir J.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster,Philip S.(Warwick,S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn.J.E. (Elgin&Nairn
Gordon,Maj.Evans-(T'rH'ml'ts
Gore, Hn. S.F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton(Tynem'th)
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath,Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath,James (Staffords.,N.W.)
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford,W.)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse,RtHnH.(Somers't,E
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Kent,Faversham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jameson, Major G. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kennaway, Rt.Hn.Sir JohnH.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo.T.(Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.(Salop
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hon.Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar(Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson JohnGrant(Yorks.N.R
Lee,Arthur H.(Hants,Fareham
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col.Charles W.(Evesham
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter (Bristol,S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver,SirLewis(Edinburgh,W.
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W.F.
Maxwell, Rt Hn.SirH.E(Wigt'n
Maxwell,W.J.H.(Dumfriesshire
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Moore, William
Morgan,DavidJ.(Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray,Rt.Hn.A.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nolan,Col. John P.(Galway,N.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington
Peel,Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, S.Forde(Bethnal Green
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel,SirHarryS.(Limehouse
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone,W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Smith,H.C(North'mb.Tyneside
Smith, James Parker(Lanarks.)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hn. Arthur(Ormskirk
Stanley,Edward Jas.(Somerset)
Stanley, Rt.Hn.Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col.Sir C.E.H.(Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C.E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt. Col.A.C.E.(Taunton
Welby, SirCharlesG.E.(Notts.
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York,E.R.)
Wilson-Todd, SirW.H.(Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B.Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood
and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Capt. E E (S. Andrw's Bghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Field, William
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hain, Edward
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk
Hutton, Alfred E. (Mortley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, William, Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W.)
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leamy, Edmund
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Doherty, William
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Mussell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely, Maj. J. E. B (Isle of Wight)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomas, J. A (Glamorgan, Gower
Tillet, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason John Cathcart (Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wood, James
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Noes—Mr Herbert Gladstone and Mr William M'Arthur.

And, it being after Eleven of the clock, the Chairman proceeded, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 5th July, successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments moved by the Government of which notice had been given, and on every Question necessary to dispose of the allotted Business to be concluded on the first allotted Day.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 13, after the word 'an,' to insert the word 'existing.'—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 16, after the word 'district,' to insert the words 'on the consideration by them, in accordance with the Licensing Acts, 1828 to 1902, of applications for the renewal of licences.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 17, after the word 'particular,' to insert the word 'existing.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 19, after the word 'an,' to insert the word "existing."—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 23, after the word 'premises,' to insert the words 'and unless it appears to quarter sessions unnecessary, any other persons appearing to them to be interested in the question of the renewal of the licence of those premises.'" — (*Mr. Secretary Akers Douglas*).

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The Committee divided; Ayes, 285; Noes, 198. (Division List No. 211.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Lt.-Col. H. F. (Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Bull, William James
Burdett-Couts, W.
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A (Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, W. Bromley
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Doogan, P. C.
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Gordon, Maj Evans (T'r H'mlets
Gore, Hn. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hardy, Laurence (Kent Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R. (Dulwich)
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George

Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham)
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. F. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks. N.R.
Lee, Arthur H (Hants. Fareham
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, Reginald J (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon, Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M‘Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M‘Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M‘Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
M‘Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F
Maxwell, Rt Hn. Sir H E (Wigt'n
Maxwell, W. J. H (Dumfriesshire
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Moore, William
Morgan, David J. (Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nolan, Col. J. P. (Galway, N.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharpe
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herb. (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir Harry S. (Limehouse
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, HC (North'mb, Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M‘Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E H (Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks.)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herb. Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Delany, William
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph

Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice,CaptE.C(S.Andrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans,SirFrancisH (Maidstone
Evans,Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Girffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hain, Edward
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt,Lewis V (Rossendale
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, J. Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owens, Arthur C.
Hutchinson,Dr.Chas. Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones,DavidBrynmor (Swansea
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy,Vincent P.(Cavan,W.
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Law,Hugh Alex. (Donegal,W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leamy, Edmund
Leese,SirJoseph F.(Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley,Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt, Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary Mid
O'Doherty, William
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, N.
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely, Maj.J. E. B.(IsleofWight
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Stevenson, Francis S.
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen),E.
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas,J.A(Glamorgan,Gower
Tillet, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds,S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, JohnCathcart (Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Fred.W.(Norfolk,Mid.)
Wilson, Henry J.(York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wood, James
Woodhouse,SirJ.T.(Hudd'rsf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Noes.—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) said he wished to ask on a point of order whether those Members of the House who were personally and pecuniarily interested in the result of the division were entitled to vote.

*The CHAIRMAN: The Rule of the House has always been that any Member who has a direct pecuniary interest is liable to have his vote struck off. I think I have correctly stated the Rule.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.) asked, as a matter of practice, in order to avoid complications and difficulties in the future, at what time should objection be taken to the votes of Members who had a direct personal pecuniary interest? The proper manner, he knew, would be to take objection immediately after the division, but there were so many gentlemen involved that they could not immediately bring all the votes that should be challenged to the notice of the House. Could they save themselves by taking formal exception now and giving notice that when the division list was printed they would bring the question before the House?

*THE CHAIRMAN: The practice has always been to call the attention of the House to the matter directly the division is taken.

Question put, "That Clause 1, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 281; Noes, 194. (Division List No. 212.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Lt.-Col. H.F. (Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A (Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Doogan, P. C.
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson, Rt. Hn Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn. J.E. (Elgin & Nairn
Gordon, Maj Evans (T'r H'mlets
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby (Linc.)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynemouth
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R. (Dulwich)
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.)
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, John (Kent Faversham
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks. N. R
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh, W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, Rt. Hn. Sir H. E (Wigt'n
Maxwell, W. J. H (Dumfriesshire
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Moore, William
Morgan, David J. (Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.

Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir Harry S. (Limehouse
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, H. C. (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col Sir C. E. H (Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Col. C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashtonund Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cullinan, J
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Capt E. C. (St Andrw's Bghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hain, Edward
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt Lewis V. (Rossendale
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwal
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Newnes, Sir George

Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid.
O'Doherty, William
O'Dowd, John
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas

Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely, Maj. J.E.B.(Isle of Wight
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Stevenson, Francis S.
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C.(Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A.(Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr

Thomas, J. A (Glamorgan, Gower
Tillet, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wood, James
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Hudd'rsfi'd
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Noes—Mr Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: Mr. Chairman, I desire to call your attention to the fact that in the last division a number of Members voted in contravention of a Standing Order of the House. I refer to Order No. 143 which precribes that—

> "A Member may not vote on any question in which he has a direct pecuniary interest."

I am going to submit to you the names of several Members who have a direct pecuniary interest in the subject-matter of the last division, and who voted in support of that interest. There have been two divisions on the question of compensation—one at eleven o'clock and the other the last division. In the first the majority was sixty-nine, and of those sixty-three had a direct pecuniary interest in the subject. I will pick out one or two instances and ask the judgment of the House upon them. I will take first the case of the hon. Member for South Salford. I submit that that hon. Member has a direct pecuniary interest in the vote he has recorded; it was a vote in favour of giving compensation for the first time in respect of licences disallowed. Under the present law he would receive no compensation in respect of houses the licences of which were refused renewal by the magistrates. The moment this Bill becomes law it will add enormously to the value of his property; it will appreciate the value of the brewery shares he holds; and in respect of any houses which, in future, are disallowed he will receive a direct pecuniary advantage. In the circumstances, I submit that the vote of the hon. Member should be disallowed, and I move that the vote of the hon. Member for South Salford in the last division be disallowed on the ground that he had a direct pecuniary interest in the vote which he recorded.

*__Mr. CHAIRMAN__: There is no Standing Order that is applicable to the case. The book from which the hon. Member has quoted is not the Standing Orders, although I have no doubt that they are correctly stated in that book. The last ruling that I can find on the subject occurred on the Local Government (Ireland) Bill, 1898, when Mr. Speaker ruled as follows—

> "The Rule of the House is well understood. There must be a direct pecuniary interest of a private and particular nature, and not of a public and general nature; and where the question before the House is of a public and general nature, and incidentally involves the pecuniary interests of a class which includes Members of the House, they are not prevented by the Rules of the House from voting.

Therefore I do not think the Motion of the hon. Member would be in order.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: I understand that Mr. Speaker's ruling was that where the pecuniary advantage was incidental the general rule would not apply. I submit, however, that here the advantage is not incidental, but that the whole object and purpose of this Bill and this clause is to confer a direct pecuniary interest upon this class, and, as a matter of fact, does confer it. Therefore, I submit, this case comes within the Standing Order.

*The CHAIRMAN: I know that view is taken by the hon. Member and by a great many other hon. Members, but I think he will admit that it is not the universal view. [Opposition cries of "It ought to be left to the House."] There is also this to be said, that it is perfectly possible that the hon. Member's financial position will not be affected in any way. [Opposition cries of "Let him say whether or not it is."] Will hon. Members kindly allow me to finish the sentence? Supposing that none of the licences in which he is interested are affected. The interest of the hon. Member is not of that direct personal character to which the ruling of Mr. Speaker refers.

Mr. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs): May I call your attention to the Rule which says—

> "The Member whose vote is questioned by such a Motion may rise in his place to explain his position."

*The CHAIRMAN: I have already said that for the reasons I have given I do not think such a Motion as that which has been suggested can be properly moved

Mr. THOMAS SHAW (Hawick Burghs): As I understand, you have put the supposition to the Committee that the interest of the hon. Member may not be affected. I respectfully submit to you, Sir, that we should have that as a matter of fact, or otherwise, stated by the hon. Member.

Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham): May I quote a specific case? I believe it is the fact that the hon. Member had negotiations with the justices of Manchester in regard to certain houses in which he is interested and an arrangement had been practically come to whereby the licences of those houses were to be surrendered. But owing to the interview between the Prime Minister and the brewers a year ago—I think the hon. Member's own avowal has acknowledged that—those negotiations fell through. Can it, therefore, be argued after that that the hon. Member is not directly interested.

*The CHAIRMAN: I do not know anything about the facts referred to by the hon. Member. I base myself upon the ruling of Mr. Speaker in the case to which I have referred.

> ". . . . where the question . . . . is of a public and general nature—"

I think it is so in this case—["No."]—

> "and incidentally involves the pecuniary interest of a class which includes Members of the House they are not prevented by the Rules of the House from voting."

Mr. WHITTAKER: On the point of order may I submit that this is not a measure of a public nature; it does not incidentally include a class. It refers entirely to a class, and only to that class.

*The CHAIRMAN: I cannot accept the view of the hon. Member that this Bill does not deal with matters of a public nature.

Mr. MOULTON (Cornwall, Launceston): May I point out that the rule begins by saying, "A Member may not vote on any question in which he has a pecuniary interest"?

*The CHAIRMAN: What Rule is that?

Mr. MOULTON: Rule 143. Surely it is a question of fact whether or not the Member whose vote is challenged has a direct pecuniary interest. May I suggest that it is not for you, Sir, as Chairman of Committees, to be, in your official character, so well-acquainted with his private affairs as to be able to pronounce whether a Member has or has not a direct pecuniary interest? The ruling that was given in May with regard to that says—

> "The interest must be a direct pecuniary interest, and separately belonging to the persons whose votes are questioned and not in common with the rest of His Majesty's subjects."

The hon. Member put it as a question of fact that in this case the vote with regard to the compensation for licences is a vote in a matter in which the Member, whose vote is challenged, has a direct pecuniary interest, and I submit that the House has a right to have that——

*The CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is entitled to submit a point of order to me, but I do not think he will be in order in making a speech on it. May I point out to the hon. Member that what he has quoted from is really a manual or guide? He has not quoted from the Standing Orders. The Standing Orders of the House do not refer to this matter, but I have quoted from the last decision of Mr. Speaker on the subject. Mr. Speaker decides points of order as they rise in the House, and it is my duty to decide upon points of order that arise in Committee.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham) said, on the point of order, Sir, may I ask whether the conduct of the hon. Member in question falls within the ruling of Mr. Speaker which you have quoted, and is not rather a matter for the House than the Chair?

*THE CHAIRMAN: If it had been, Mr. Speaker would not have ruled it.

And, it being after Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

ADJOURNMENT.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Sir A. ACLAND-HOOD, Somersetshire, Wellington) moved, "That the House do now adjourn."

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) said he wished to ask a question with reference to the present position in Tibet. He understood that some information had been received in the course of the day with reference to certain operations which had taken place. He should like to know what the result of those operations had been, and also whether, in view of what had taken place, the time had not now arrived for the Government to give the House some indication of the effect of those operations with regard to their future policy. They wanted to know whether the right hon. Gentleman could now repeat the statement he made some months ago that the operations were at an end. What was the attitude of the Government with regard to this matter, and had any instructions been given to the officer in command of our forces there? He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would be able to give the House some information which would lead them to believe that they were coming to an end of this sorry business.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham) asked the right hon. Gentleman to explain why information received by the Government had been published in the newspapers before being communicated to this House.

MR. FLYNN (Cork County, N.) said he wished to call attention to the fact that the suzerain Power had not been consulted in this matter. It had been deliberately ignored, and the present operations were a distinct violation of the promises made by the Prime Minister on the floor of the House a short time ago. The right hon. Gentleman stated that the negotiations were to be of a peaceful character, and he said most distinctly that there was no intention of warlike operations, or of annexing or occupying territory. He trusted that the right hon. Gentleman would be able to give a distinct assurance that warlike operations would not be conducted against a peaceful people.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.) said there was news going through the city in the afternoon that some operations had taken place. Why was the Minister in charge of the India Office not present to explain to the House what had happened? Was his office a mere sinecure? He thought it was a very great scandal that the right hon. Gentleman was not present. He was very well paid for being present.

MR. STUART SAMUEL (Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel) asked the right hon. Gentleman to be good enough to state whether there were any gold mines in Tibet.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) said he wished to know what our position was with regard to China. Were we at war with China, or were we trying to put down some troubles in a country of which China was suzerain?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford) said he might be allowed to reply in the first place to the remarks of the hon. Member who spoke last but two. That hon. Gentleman's complaint was that he was not present to give information at Question time. As there were no Questions on the Paper addressed to him, and as no Member had given him private notice of his intention to ask for information, he was not actually in the House when the Question was put, but he had been in the precincts since the House met. If there had been any important communication to be made to the House he would not have failed to be present there. The Government had received no confirmation as yet of the information in Reuter's telegrams that afternoon as to the force at Gyangtse having occupied the Jong, but as soon as any information was received he would communicate it through the Press. [Loud cries of "To the House of Commons."] An hon. Gentleman had asked a Question as to the policy of His Majesty's Government. He thought it was too late an hour — [Loud OPPOSITION cries of "No, No!"]— to enter on a disquisition as to the work of His Majesty's forces in Tibet. All he could say was that the policy of His Majesty's Government had changed in no single particular from what was laid down in the telegram to the Viceroy of 6th November last year, and which had been repeatedly affirmed by the House. The operations of the last few days had led the Government to hope that, at last, Tibetan representatives would approach Colonel Younghusband; and a delay had been made in the advance to Lhasa, which had been fixed for the 25th of last month; but it appeared that the Tibetan representatives were not possessed of sufficient credentials, or of any credentials at all. They were there apparently simply to delay the advance of our troops, which it was desirable should not be delayed within the comparatively short time which should pass before the commencement of the Tibetan winter. At any moment negotiations might take place if the Tibetan authorities would send negotiators with sufficient powers to negotiate. It was not the desire of His Majesty's Government to ask for anything at variance with their previous declaration, or to make any more onerous conditions of reparation for what had taken place, and what the House had affirmed to be necessary.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said he thought that the explanation was very unsatisfactory. The point he wished to draw attention to was, that if the Government had received no special news from India, how was it that the Prime Minister had possessed himself of a telegram which he read to the House that afternoon? Had the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for India read that telegram?

MR. BRODRICK: Telegrams are constantly passing between the India Office and the Viceroy.

MR. LOUGH said he thought the right hon. Gentleman was treating the matter with some levity. The telegram which the Prime Minister had read to the House stated that the bombardment of the Jong had commenced at a certain hour; but it was said that the result was not in the possession of the Government. He asked the Secretary for India whether any supplementary telegram had been received by the Government. When serious warlike operations of this kind were being undertaken, the Government ought to afford the House some information. He understood that a British officer had been killed and that other serious casualties had taken place, and he thought that some information should be given to the House. On the larger question raised about negotiations with the Tibetans, the right hon. Gentleman repeated that the Government desired to negotiate with them. But if these Tibetans did not desire to negotiate and wanted to simply live peacefully in their own land, was this policy of butchery and extermination to be carried out to the bitter end? Perhaps the Prime Minister would give the House some information. He was responsible for the Government. He was sure that it would be received with satisfaction by the country that there was some prospect that these cruel operations against a people practically unarmed would be put a stop to.

Question put, and agreed to.

Adjourned at twenty-five minutes before One o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 7th July, 1904.

LORD HENNIKER.

Ordered, That the Report of the Lord Chancellor of the United Kingdom, made to the House of Lords on Friday last, that the right of the Lord Henniker to vote at the elections of Representative Peers for Ireland has been established to his satisfaction, be sent to the Clerk of the Crown in Ireland, together with a certificate stating that such Report has been made and that the House has ordered it to be sent to the said Clerk of the Crown in Ireland.

SAT FIRST.

The Duke of Richmond sat first in Parliament after the death of his father.

The Lord Hartismere (*L. Henniker*) sat first in Parliament after the death of his father.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Thames River Steamboat Service Bill; Strabane, Raphoe, and Convoy Railway Bill. Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee adjourned yesterday over this day; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

Saddleworth and Springhead Tramways Bill; London County Council (General Powers) Bill. Examiner's Certificates of non-compliance with the Standing Orders referred to the Standing Orders Committee on Tuesday next.

City of London (Central Criminal Court House) Bill. Reported, without Amendment.

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill; London and India Docks Company Bill; Swindon Corporation Bill; Middlesbrough, Stockton-on-Tees, and Thornaby Tramways Bill; Carlisle Corporation Bill; Clyde Navigation (Works) Bill. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Earl of Craven be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Lovat; read, and agreed to.

Strabane, Raphoe, and Convoy Railway Bill. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Ashburton be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bill in the place of the Earl of Bradford; read, and agreed to.

Leyton Urban District Council Bill. Moved, That the order made on the 14th day of March last, "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 16th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2^a; agreed to. Bill read 2^a accordingly and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Buxton Urban District Council Bill [H.L]. Read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Soothill Nether Urban District Tramways Bill; Doncaster Corporation Bill; Skipton Water and Improvement Bill. Read 3^a, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Selby Urban District Council Bill. Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; and referred to the Examiners.

St. Mary Woolnoth Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to.

Minehead Urban District Council Water Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments; the said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill. Returned from the Commons with the Amendment agreed to.

Aberdeen Joint Passenger Station Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.] (No. 135). A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order relating to Aberdeen Joint Passenger Station. And

Dumbartonshire (Vale of Leven) Water Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.] (No. 136). A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order relating to Dumbartonshire (Vale of Leven) Water.—Were presented by the Earl Waldegrave (for the Lord Kintore (*E. Kintore*)); read 1^a; to be printed; and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899 (Section 7), deemed to have been read 2ª and reported from the Committee.

Education Board Provisional Order (Cardiff) Bill. Moved, That the order made on the 14th day of March last, "That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 16th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2ª; agreed to. Bill read 2ª accordingly and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]. House in Committee (according to order). The Amendments proposed by the Select Committee made; further Amendments made. Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow.

Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. House in Committee (according to order). Amendments made. Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow.

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]; Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [H.L.]. Amendments reported (according to order), and Bills to be read 3ª To-morrow.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]. Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

PETITIONS.

SUPPLY OF ELECTRICITY BILL [H.L.].

Petition to be heard by Counsel against; of the Gas Companies Protection Association; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

OUTDOOR RELIEF (FRIENDLY SOCIETIES) BILL [H.L.].

Petition against; of the Guardians of the Poor of the Parish of Paddington; the Guardians of the Poor of the Chorley Union; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Regulations for the instruction and training of pupil teachers (from 1st August, 1904, to 31st July, 1905).

Minute of the Board of Education, dated 7th July, 1904, modifying Code of Regulations for Public Elementary Schools, 1904.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3204. Roumania.
No. 3205. Hayti.
No. 3206. Russia (Batoum).
No. 3207. United States (Oregon, Washington, and Idaho).
No. 3208. Italy (Leghorn).

GOVERNMENT LABORATORY.

Report of the Principal Chemist upon the work of the Government Laboratory, for the year ended 31st March, 1904; with appendices.

FISHERIES (SCOTLAND).

Twenty-second Annual Report of the Fishery Board for Scotland, being for the year 1903. Part III. Scientific Investigations.

TRADE WITH PERSIA (BOARD OF TRADE COMMERCIAL INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEE).

Report on the condition and prospects of British trade in Persia, by H. W. Maclean, Special Commissioner of the Commercial Intelligence Committee of the Board of Trade.

CONSULAR REPORTS.

Index to Reports of His Majesty's Diplomatic and Consular Representatives Abroad on Trade and Subjects of General Interest (with Appendix), 1903.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

SUPERANNUATION (PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS).

Treasury minute, dated 30th June, 1904, declaring that for the due and efficient discharge of the duties of the office of Director of Barrack Construction, War Office, professional or other peculiar qualifications not ordinarily to be acquired on the Public Service are required. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

CHANTREY TRUST.

The evidence taken before the Select Committee from time to time to be printed, but no copies to be delivered out except to members of the Committee, and such other persons as the Committee shall think fit, until further order. (No. 132.)

NEW BILLS.

SOLWAY SALMON FISHERIES BILL [H.L.].

A Bill to form part of the Solway Firth into a fishery district for the purposes of the Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Acts, 1861 to 1892, and to constitute a Board of Conservators of that district, and for other matters connected therewith —Was presented by the Earl of Onslow; read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Tuesday next. (No. 133.)

COUNTY COURTS BILL [H.L.].

A Bill to amend the law relating to county courts—Was presented by the Lord Chancellor; read 1ª; and to be printed. (No. 134.)

MERCHANT SHIPPING BILL [H.L.].

[Third Reading.]

Order of the Day for the Third Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª."—(*Lord Wolverton.*)

*Lord **ELLENBOROUGH**: My Lords, before this Bill is read a third time I wish to make a few comments upon it. It is a measure to amend the Merchant Shipping Act of 1894. That Act by no means brought shipping legislation up to date. It did not alter the law at all. A reference to *Hansard* shows that it was described by the then Lord Chancellor as a codification of the existing law, and similar language was used in regard to it by Mr. Mundella and Mr. Bryce. It is true that some minor Acts have been passed since, but the law remains substantially what it was in 1894. The greater part of the Act of 1894 is therefore simply a recapitulation of the law as it existed more than half a century ago, when steam and electricity were in their infancy and the whole of the legislation as regards merchant shipping is in consequence very much behindhand. This Bill only deals with the fringe of some of the questions that will before long require solution.

I look upon this Bill as an instalment only. If it is found that the worst class of merchant ships will spontaneously adopt a scale of provisions better than the "pound and pint" scale, no one will be more agreeably surprised than myself, except, perhaps, the happy seaman who will actually eat the better ration. This Bill does not attempt to deal with the housing of the seaman. I am fully prepared to admit that this is a very difficult problem, far more so than the provisioning. But it ought not to be beyond the wit of man to devise remedies. I should suggest that the Board of Trade should tell the better class of shipowners that it is intended to legislate on the subject, and that it wishes for their advice as to the wording of the clauses so that they may not be inconvenienced by such legislation more than is absolutely necessary. If shipowners continue to adopt a *non possumus* attitude towards all changes in the law connected with the merchant seamen, there will always be a danger of a new Plimsoll agitation, and of hurried legislation in a passing fit of enthusiasm.

The merchant seaman has a peculiar claim on this House, because, from the very nature of his circumstances, he is about the only class of working man who is unrepresented in the House of Commons. Even if he is a married man with a house and home of his own, he is probably away at the time of an election. I have always thought that this House should look upon itself as being in some measure a trustee for the unrepresented portions of the community. As this Bill is a small step in the right direction, I hope that it may pass into law this year, and that during the recess the Board of Trade will reconsider all questions in connection with the merchant seaman, and that it will be ready with a fresh Bill in February. I may be too sanguine, but I am encouraged in this hope by the fact that a Select Committee of the other House is taking evidence on the broader aspects of these questions, especially as to how some of our restrictive regulations can be applied to vessels frequenting our ports under foreign flags.

LORD WOLVERTON: I am very glad to hear the welcome that my noble friend, who is so well qualified to speak on this subject, has given to the Bill. I have, of course, no power to initiate legislation, but I will undertake that the remarks he has made on the Third Reading shall reach the President of the Board of Trade.

On Question, Bill read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

THE CASE OF THE "ANTILLIAN."

LORD MUSKERRY: My Lords, I rise to call attention to the case of the captain of the British steamer "Antillian," who was lately imprisoned under degrading conditions in the common gaol at Vera Cruz by order of the Mexican authorities; and to ask whether it is a fact that the case has been dismissed by the Mexican Judge at Campeche, and the captain released unconditionally: also, whether, in regard to the representations made by the Merchant Service Guild, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs has extended his support to the captain's claim for compensation for the unjustifiable treatment to which he has been subjected; and whether he is able to give any further information bearing on the case.

I feel that I must first express the great satisfaction that is felt at the way in which the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs has interested himself in regard to this matter. It cannot but be greatly appreciated by the captains and officers of our merchant ships, who in their dealings at foreign ports frequently experience great difficulties, and sometimes consider that their interests as British subjects are not always protected as they might be by representatives of this country abroad. I need only mention the case of the "Greylands," where two officers and some of the crew of a merchant vessel were confined in prison for nearly five months without trial, the cases of the "Isleworth" and the "Ivydene," and the case of the chief officer of the British ship "Kambira" to substantiate this.

In the particular case to which I am calling attention, however, there is absolutely no doubt that everything possible has so far been done by the noble Marquess, by the British Minister at the city of Mexico, Mr. Grant Duff, and by Mr. Consul Leay at Vera Cruz. They, as our representatives on the spot, deserve great credit. For your Lordships' information I will mention briefly the facts, which are that whilst the steamer "Antillian" was lying at Kingston, Jamaica, her captain was ordered by the agents of his owners at that port to carry a number of labourers to a place called Chencan, on the Mexican coast. A proper clearance was obtained at the Kingston Custom House stating the number of crew and passengers, and a bill of health for the port was also obtained. There was, however, no Custom House at Chencan, but the agents informed the captain that they had sent a cable to the city of Mexico, and that a Customs representative and doctor would meet the steamer at Chencan. On arrival these officials were not waiting the vessel, as expected, and consequently the captain thought it would be perfectly safe to land the labourers with their personal effects. Proceeding from thence to Vera Cruz all the papers were handed in to the Customs officials with the usual declaration form stating that the vessel landed the passengers and effects at Chencan, as I have mentioned. Everything was perfectly above-board, and three days after this the steamer finished discharging and was ready for sea.

To the surprise of all concerned the port authorities then detained the steamer, and, four days after, arrested the captain on a charge of smuggling contraband into Chencan. He was thereupon confined in the common gaol amongst criminals of the worst kind. This treatment was strongly protested against by Mr. Leay, the British Consul. After three days in what are described as "filthy surroundings and frightful atmosphere," the captain became ill, and though the British Consul used every endeavour to get him into a private ward, he was lodged in the criminal ward of the hospital, where the horrors are described by the captain as still greater. On the facts being communicated to him Mr. Duff, the British Minister at Mexico, at once interviewed the Mexican Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, and as further delay arose he proceeded to the private residence of the Mexican Minister for Foreign Affairs. The result was that ultimately the captain was released on bail, amounting to 3,000 dollars, and the steamer was permitted to leave under a bond of, it is said, 20,000 dollars.

The Foreign Office, in communicating with the Merchant Service Guild, stated that they were informed that the captain appeared to be in a state of complete nervous prostration in consequence of his treatment, and that he had lodged a claim for compensation for £1,000 for himself and £3,000 on behalf of his owners, the steamer being detained. The Acting District Judge at Vera Cruz decided that the captain's trial should take place at Campeche, but that place being, if possible, even more unhealthy than Vera Cruz, the British Minister did everything in his power to have the decision reversed, but evidently without avail. Before proceeding to Campeche the captain was furnished by the British Consul at Vera Cruz with a letter to the British Vice-Consul at Progreso, as there is no British Consular Officer at Campeche. The agents of his line of steamers provided him with food, also a bed and mosquito curtain during his imprisonment, and retained counsel for his defence. The result, sofar as I have been able to gather, is that the judge at Campeche dismissed the case and referred it to the Custom House at Mexico City, whilst he informed the captain that he was at liberty to proceed to England.

Of course, I am not endeavouring to justify smuggling or anything of its character, but the circumstances are such as to show that in this case there has been nothing of the kind. Even were there suspicion of it, I venture to submit that the captain of a British merchant ship should command proper consideration in a case of this character. Apart from the outrageous treatment to which he has been subjected, and from which he has suffered very considerably in health, the captain of the "Antillian," on being imprisoned, lost the command of his vessel, which is really a very serious matter to him. It is, I think, necessary that when British subjects are imposed upon and treated in this scandalous way His Majesty's Government should step in. We know very well that a Mexican captain in one of our own ports would be treated far differently over a case similar in circumstances to that of the captain of the "Antillian." I hope to hear that the noble Marquess is supporting what I feel to be a reasonable and fair claim for compensation, and if he is able to give any further information it would be welcomed by very many who have been impressed by the cruel and unjustifiable treatment to which the captain of the "Antillian" has been subjected.

*The SECRETARY of STATE for FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of Lansdowne): My Lords, the account of this case which has reached me does not differ materially from that which the noble Lord has given to the House. It seems to me that, *prima facie*, Captain Wescott's treatment was of a harsh and unjustifiable character, and that it is the duty of His Majesty's Government to pursue inquiries into the matter. Of course, as the noble Lord has admitted, the landing of passengers and goods at a place which is not a port of entry and where there is no Custom House is, on the fact of it, an irregularity, but there is nothing to show that Captain Wescott was guilty of that irregularity deliberately. On the contrary, the evidence proves that he landed at Chencan in consequence of instructions received from the agents of the firm by whom he is employed. His ship was detained, and he was thrown into prison, and although he only remained in prison three days, he seems to have been subjected, to say the least of it, to very disagreeable and painful surroundings which occasioned him for the time a loss of health. He was eventually tried and, as the noble Lord has told your Lordships, the Court acquitted him of criminal responsibility, but the case was handed over to the Commissioner of Customs at Campeche.

Lord MUSKERRY: Mexico.

*The Marquess of LANSDOWNE: I believe he was handed over to the Commissioner of Customs at Campeche and that the matter was then referred to the Customs authorities at Mexico. The case is, I understand, still *sub judice*. Captain Wescott has claimed £3,000 as compensation for, the detention of his ship, and £1,000 for the personal ill-usage which he encountered. I understand that the Board of Trade are of opinion that some claim for compensation exists, but they do not desire to express any opinion as to the reasonableness of the amount claimed until we have received further information from our Chargé d'Affaires in Mexico, to whom the matter has been referred. I was very glad to hear the noble Lord admit that Mr. Grant Duff, as well as our Consul at Vera Cruz, had left nothing undone in their endeavours to secure redress for Captain Wescott. The papers which are before me show that Mr. Grant Duff spared no pains to convince the authorities that Mr. Wescott had been guilty merely of an error of judgment, and that no crime could be imputed to him. That is how the matter stands. We shall, no doubt, hear in due time from our Chargé d'Affaires; and if he should report that in his opinion a claim for compensation can be sustained, the noble Lord may rely upon it that we shall press the claim to the utmost of our ability.

THE MARITIME CONFERENCE AT BRUSSELS.

Lord MUSKERRY: My Lords, I rise to put the Question standing in my name, viz., whether a deputation consisting of representatives of the General Council of the Bar, the International Law Association, the Committee of Lloyd's, the Chamber of Shipping of the United Kingdom, the Liverpool Chamber of Commerce, the Liverpool Steamship Owners' Association, the North of England Steamship Owners' Association, the Glasgow Chamber of Commerce, the Glasgow Shipowners' Association, and the Hull Chamber of Commerce and Shipping, has urged upon the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs the necessity of His Majesty's Government being represented at the forthcoming International Maritime Conference at Brussels, in order to, among other things, promote greater uniformity in the maritime law of different nations; whether His Majesty's Government have declined to accede to the proposal, and, if so, for what reasons; also, whether, in view of the weight of public opinion on the subject, and its great importance to British shipping, His Majesty's Government propose to assist in any way in promoting uniformity in the maritime law of different nations.

Before dealing with this question I should like to give notice that I propose to ask the noble Marquess what protection the British flag is supposed to confer on its subjects, or others who are on board a vessel flying the British flag. My reason for doing this is that I have always been under the impression that though Custom House officers are allowed——

The LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of Halsbury): I would point out to the noble Lord that he is now transgressing the Rules of Order.

Lord MUSKERRY: May I put myself in order by moving the adjournment of the House?

The LORD CHANCELLOR: The noble Lord has given notice of a Question which he proposes to ask on a future day, and is beginning to give arguments upon it. That is clearly out of order.

Lord MUSKERRY: Then I will proceed with the Question standing in my name on the Paper. When putting this notice down I had not seen the reply sent by the noble Marquess to the International Law Association. It is a refusal to be represented at this International Maritime Congress, and I quite acknowledge that there may be very good reasons for the noble Marquess's decision, but I would ask him to consider one point in the matter. As you know, whenever I have brought anything before your Lordships' House in the shape of precautions for safeguarding lives of men at sea I have always been met with the argument—and I suppose I shall continue to be until things are altered—that to adopt them would be placing our shipowners in an unfair position in competition with foreign nations who do not adopt them. I do not know what your Lordships think of that argument, but, in my opinion, it is extraordinary that because other nations do not take precautions for the safety of the lives of their subjects we in England should not do so, but should wait until they have joined in taking those precautions. It seems to me that there may be a possibility in this Maritime Congress, and in other similar congresses, of the British Government approaching other nations purely from a humanitarian point of view, and seeing if they will not join in an international arrangement for remedying what has not been denied is a great risk, not only to our own seamen but to the seamen of every other country on the high seas.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, it is the case that I had the honour of receiving some few weeks ago a deputation representing the important public bodies enumerated in the noble Lord's Question, and that the object of that deputation was to urge upon His Majesty's Government the necessity of their being represented at the forthcoming International Maritime Conference at Brussels. It is also the case that after consideration and inquiry I felt it my duty to inform the members of that deputation that His Majesty's Government did not propose to take part in the proceedings of that Conference. The reason which led us to that decision was this: in view of the great magnitude of British shipping interests we did not consider that it was desirable that this country should take such a part in a conference of the kind proposed as might have the effect of in any way committing us to measures adopted by other countries whose interest is infinitely smaller than ours, but whose representation upon such a conference would be equal to our own. That is a consideration which, I believe, has, on previous occasions, induced the Government of the day to abstain from taking part in similar inquiries. While I say that, I readily admit that we recognise the great importance of endeavouring to arrive, as far as possible, at uniformity in the maritime law of nations. In such matters, for example, as the law in regard to collisions, the salvage of ships, or pilotage, it is clearly desirable that the laws of different countries should, as nearly as may be, correspond; and, therefore, if it should result from the discussions of this conference that any proposals are made with that most laudable object, the noble Lord may rest assured that we shall be prepared to examine those proposals in the most friendly and considerate spirit.

THE PUPIL TEACHER SYSTEM.

LORD HERRIES: My Lords, I rise to ask the President of the Board of Education whether he will take into consideration the necessity of making special grants towards the travelling expenses of pupil teachers attending pupil teachers' centres in agricultural districts. My reason for putting this question is that I do not think the Board of Education quite realise the very great difference which will be entailed by the new regulations in the course of the education of pupil teachers—the very great difference there will be between the cost in towns and the cost in the country. The Board of Education have not, apparently taken into consideration the distance these pupil teachers will have to travel. I have asked the clerk to the education committee in the East Riding of Yorkshire to let me know what the travelling expenses of the pupil teachers are there, and he informs me that while the cost of education in three pupil teachers' centres only amounts to £450, the travelling expenses run to £400, very nearly as much as the cost of the education. In the towns that expense is saved, and it seems to me there should be some recognition of this fact and special grants made in agricultural districts in order to defray the extra cost.

It is bad enough as things are at present, but it will be worse when the new regulations come into force. Under the new regulations which will come into force next year, pupil teachers will not be allowed to serve more than half time in a public elementary school; they must receive half-time instruction at some pupil teachers' centre. That means that for two and a half days a week they will have to attend a pupil teachers' centre. Where we have now one pupil teacher in our schools we shall, therefore, have to have two, because they will have to attend half time at the centre; and if they are ten or twelve miles from the centre it will be necessary to pay their expenses backwards and forwards each day. The sum of £400, to which I have referred, is incurred with only one day a week; with two and a half days a week that expenditure will be enormously increased. In agricultural districts the cost of education is a very serious matter, and the unpopularity of the new Education Act is partly due to the fact that it will entail a very great expenditure upon the country.

For myself I must say I do sympathise with those agriculturists who have to pay in respect of education, I was going to say an income-tax, because it amounts to an income-tax in the case of many agriculturists. In some cases it amounts to 10, 15, and even 20 per cent. of their income. I know farmers paying £1,000 a year rent who are rated upon £1,000 a year, and having to pay 6d. in the £. I have no doubt that last year the education rate amounted to at least 10 per cent. of their income. Next year the expenditure upon pupil teachers will be very much greater. How they are going to get over the difficulty which faces them I do not know. It will be for the county councils to consider. There are several ways of getting over the difficulty, and I am afraid it will be found that in some counties, at any rate, a very unsatisfactory mode may be chosen. It will be possible, for instance, for a county council to come to the conclusion that the expenditure on training pupil teachers is so great that they will not train them, but will rely upon other towns and other cities to train them, feeling that by paying slightly higher salaries they will be able to procure a sufficient supply of teachers without having the expense of training them. That is one possible way of meeting the difficulty, but I think it is a very unsatisfactory one, and I should be very sorry to see that method carried into operation.

Another mode which may be selected by the county councils is that of starving the secondary schools. At present the grants received for the purposes of secondary education have been most beneficial. I have had the honour of being chairman of our education committee for twelve or fourteen years, and I can say this, that during the time these grants have been made the attendance at secondary schools has increased eight-fold. The advantage that has been conferred by these grants to secondary education has been enormous. I should be sorry to think that by the new scheme about to be introduced any injury should be done to the secondary education of the country, but I do fear that if we have to spend such an enormous sum of money upon the education of our pupil teachers that may possibly be the result. The third way of meeting the difficulty would be by having a rate, and I must say I deplore the necessity of imposing a rate for the purpose of giving instruction to pupil teachers in pupil teachers' centres. I hope, therefore, my noble friend the President of the Board of Education will take into consideration the very great difference between the cost of educating pupil teachers in the country and in towns. In towns, of course, the pupils can go from one school to the other by trams or 'buses and the cost is small, but in the country, if you have to take pupil teachers ten, twelve, or fifteen miles to the centre, the expense is very great. I think in this matter the country should be placed on equal terms with the towns.

THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL AND PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (The Marquess of LONDONDERRY): My Lords, I certainly have no fault to find with the very moderate manner in which my noble friend has put this Question to me. I know full well, although I do not myself reside near the East Riding, the great interest which the noble Lord has always taken in everything connected with that Riding of Yorkshire, and the prominent part he has played in regard to education there. I am not sorry that my noble friend has raised this question, for I cannot but think that at the present moment there exists, not only in the minds of your Lordships, but throughout the country, a misapprehension as to the requirements of the pupil-teacher system. I do not think any noble Lords who have studied the question of education will contradict me when I say that the education of the pupil teachers is of enormous importance. It is the bounden duty of the education committees to see that those who are to instruct the rising generation have themselves had a proper training for that duty. We must recognise that the greater portion of the teaching staff in our elementary schools is recruited by means of our pupil-teacher system.

This system has existed now for considerably over fifty years, but up to two years ago it had not been in any way varied during that half century. Until the Act of 1902, I do not think there had been any alteration for the betterment of our system of pupil teaching. I do not wish to say anything on an occasion like this of a controversial character, but I doubt very much if noble Lords opposite have ever done anything in that direction. I do not think Mr. Acland, my predecessor at the Board of Education and a recognised educational expert, who did his utmost to discharge the duties attaching to the position, ever did anything himself to promote our pupil-teacher system, and, therefore, by the Act which became law in 1902, that system has for the first time received practical and useful aid from the Government of the day. I consider that enormous benefit will accrue to education in the future from that Act. I think our pupil-teacher system will receive enormous benefit from the provision in that Act which gives to the local authority in any area increased advantages in the promotion of the pupil-teacher system. If you go back to the foundation of this system, you will find that the only aid given was the grant paid to the elementary school where the pupil teacher was supposed to, and I presume did, teach; but until last year the sum paid to those teachers was, on an average, only about £2 per head per annum.

My noble friend laid great stress on the fact that extra expense would accrue from the new regulations of the Board of Education. I think my noble friend overlooked to a certain extent the fact that those regulations with regard to the pupil-teacher system are not compulsory but may be acted upon according to the requirements of the locality. There is no need in any area for any authority to rush headlong into any extra expense. They may take whatever course they like, and my own advice to my noble friend would be that he and his council should advance very slowly and cautiously, feeling their way in the line they propose to take. My noble friend evidently entertains the idea, and I am bound to say that I think it is an idea which is very generally held, that the regulations of the Board of Education have increased the expenditure of local authorities under the particular head to which reference is made. [" Hear, hear !"] With due deference to my noble friends who say " Hear, hear," I do not think they quite realise what the Board of Education has done in respect of these regulations, which, as I say, are not compulsory. I do not think they have realised the great importance which we naturally attach to the pupil-teacher system and the fact that we have been able to induce the Exchequer to give us largely increased grants in order to develop and improve the system.

The Board of Education issued last year some new regulations on this important matter in which, amongst other things, it was provided that a completely new grant became payable for the preliminary education in preparatory classes of boys and girls likely to become pupil teachers; and further, that the existing grant of £2 for the education of each pupil teacher was raised to £3 wherever such pupil teacher was receiving proper instruction in a well-equipped centre. Since then, in spite of the admittedly difficult financial situation this year, the Board of Education has been privileged to announce that both of these grants are this year to be doubled; that is to say, that whereas in previous years before 1903 practically no grants were payable for the preliminary education of boys and girls about to become pupil teachers, there will this year be payable for this purpose from the Exchequer as much as £4 per head. And in respect of each pupil teacher properly instructed in a well-equipped centre there will be payable a grant of £7 per head, including therein the grants hitherto payable in respect of pupil teachers instructed in science and art classes. I think your Lordships will thus admit that, so far from increasing the burden of local authorities, the present

Government have taken very long steps indeed towards alleviating the burden of local authorities in this respect.

I do not for one moment contradict what my noble friend said as to the difference between urban and rural districts. Undoubtedly in towns there are facilities which do not exist in the rural districts. I should like to be able to tell my noble friend honestly what it is possible for us to do to meet the incontestable difficulty to which he has referred, but I am sure the noble Lord would not ask me to make any premature statement or hold out to him any hope of meeting his demands which it would be impossible for me to realise. Considering the short time that the Education Act has been in force, it is impossible for us at the Board of Education to make any accurate estimate as to what may be the number of pupil teachers in the coming education year, which begins on 1st August. I am obliged, therefore, to tell my noble friend that I cannot give him any definite answer at the present moment as to what we can or cannot do. I hope, however, that before the autumn we shall have obtained statistics from the various areas, with which we are in constant communication, as to the number of pupil teachers who require this assistance. Again, I say we shall lay special stress on the fact that those in rural districts require greater assistance than those in urban districts; but until we have received the returns and been able to carefully examine the statistics and formulate some plan by which we can meet the requirements of these districts, I do not think it would be wise on my part to make any promise.

I hope that when we have formulated our plan we shall be able to meet some of these requirements, and be placed in a position to ask for even further aid from the Exchequer. But at the same time it must be understood that although we may, and I believe we shall, receive further aid from the Exchequer, I cannot promise to earmark the manner in which that extra aid is to be expended. Circumstances vary in different areas, and what might be an advantage to my noble friend in the rural district in which he takes such a great interest might not be an advantage in other more thickly populated districts. I can assure my noble friend that I sympathise with all that he has stated. It may be said that it would be convenient to local authorities that we should state what amount of money we expect to get, and the manner in which we propose to distribute it, but it is impossible at the present moment for me to give any definite answer on that point. I can only assure my noble friend that when that money comes in we shall endeavour to administer it in such a way as shall be satisfactory to the local authorities, whether they be urban or rural.

Lord HENEAGE: My Lords, I am glad my noble friend behind me has elicited from the noble Marquess an acknowledgement that there is a great difference between agricultural and urban districts. The real question is not whether county councils in the great agricultural districts, which are thinly populated and very badly supported by railroads, are obliged to go to this expense, but whether you wish to keep up the pupil-teaching system or not. I imagine that at the present time a great number of school managers in the large counties, like Lancashire, where the pupil teachers have to go a considerable distance to the centres, and where the railway accommodation is as bad as it is possible to conceive, are considering whether they will in future send pupil teachers at all to those centres. I am sure the noble Marquess, after what he has said, will agree that it is highly essential that we should train as many pupil teachers as possible both in agricultural and urban districts; but the facts have to be looked in the face.

I have had considerable experience as one of the managers of elementary schools, and I am certain of this, that it is impossible to carry out this particular provision of the Act of 1902 at the present moment. If pupil teachers are to give up one half of their time each day to attending these centres, it practically means giving up the whole of the five days, or, if they are to go for two and a half days, it means that they will have to give up three days. Therefore, if you are to have education going on in the future it will be necessary to engage two pupil teachers where you now have one, or you will have to give up sending these pupil teachers to the centres at all. I think a great deal might be done by altering the rates which they are paid in the country and in the town districts. In the towns they can go to the centres after they have done all their work, or, at any rate, after they have done a good half-day's work and at no expense to the school managers; but in the agricultural districts it is quite impossible for them to do so. There is another point I should like to bring to my noble friend's attention, and I do it with the full knowledge that he will look thoroughly into all these questions. Before the Act of 1902 came into force, school managers were in the habit of paying schoolmistresses for giving, out of hours, extra education to the pupil teachers, but they cannot do that now. The county councils are not enabled to pay anything whatever. As they have no money of their own, they cannot pay schoolmistresses, with the result that pupil teachers have to absolutely rely for any instruction they get out of school hours upon the pupil teachers' centres, which it will be impossible in many agricultural districts for them to attend.

*LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY: My Lords, I did not think when I saw this notice on the Paper that it would have grown into a discussion on the pupil-teacher system. I feel, with the noble Lord who called attention to this matter, that the problem of securing teachers in the rural districts is one of the most difficult problems that those concerned in education have to face. I do not put it so much on the question of cost; it is a very difficult matter to get them at all, and, when you have got them, to give them anything like a proper training. I could not follow the noble Marquess in what he said as to the new regulations. There have, I know, been certain notifications as to the postponement of some of the provisions of the new Pupil-Teachers' Minute, both as to age and as to the time of coming into operation, but they have been merely temporary postponements.

The new regulations for pupil teachers contemplate that very soon nobody in towns will be able to become a pupil teacher until he or she has turned sixteen. The period of pupil teachership is cut down to two years, but in rural districts it is three years. Formerly the period was four years. Recollect that these pupil teachers are to be half-timers throughout. I think that is admirable and absolutely necessary. But let me say that this half-time need not be worked each week; so long as the pupil teachers do so many days a year they may take them at a time convenient to themselves. Therefore, the Board of Education, I admit, has aimed at making this comparatively easy. What I complain of in the new Minute is that the Board of Education have tried to jump to what may be called a comparatively ideal system of training pupil teachers at a moment when it was very important not to dislocate the system, and when the improvements ought to have been introduced carefully and step by step with ample notice, because, as I have no doubt the noble Marquess will agree, the great difficulty at the present moment is where to find teachers at all. There is a great demand for better teachers. The competition is much keener than it was, and at this moment there is not only nothing substantial done to increase the supply of teachers, but the new Minute will, I feel confident, very greatly diminish the sources of supply that now exist. I was a little surprised to hear the noble Marquess say that from the establishment of the pupil-teacher system down to 1902 the system had remained stereotyped, and that nothing had been done to improve it. My recollection of the history of education does not at all correspond with that of the noble Marquess. When Mr. Lowe in his Code aimed at economies, unfortunately those economies struck at the root of the best part of education. He cut down the liberal grants to pupil teachers, he cut down the hours during which they must be instructed by their head teacher, and he left them very much at the mercy of the managers. They were thereby turned into a cheap auxiliary staff instead of pupils being gradually trained to become teachers hereafter. I feel compelled, however, to remind the noble Marquess that there have been improvements, though they have been more pressed upon the Board of Education than granted voluntarily.

Until the Cockerton judgment a great deal was done to train pupil teachers, but now, unfortunately, there obtains in the Board of Education a desire largely to sever the recruiting of pupil teachers from elementary schools. I view with very great apprehension the difficulties we shall go through in the next few years. Let me remind the noble Marquess that if he will read the evidence and the Report of the Departmental Committee, over which Mr. Sharpe, so long chief inspector of the Board, presided, he will see that some time before 1902 a very careful review of the pupil-teacher system and very valuable recommendations for its improvement were presented, and that review and those recommendations did really embody what was the practice of the best school boards at that time. When the noble Marquess paraded the recent liberality of the Government in having increased the grants to pupil teachers, he might have remembered that that liberality took the form of giving back a pound or two of that which had been previously taken away. In old days pupil teachers might get £3 or £4 a year, and it was spread over a longer period. Now the grant will be £2 at the earlier stage, when they will be studying mainly in secondary schools as full-timers at a cost of £8 or £10 a year.

When the noble Lord who initiated this discussion spoke of the possible courses that might be taken to get over the difficulty he said that one course which presented itself was that of giving up the training of pupil teachers altogether and of relying on neighbouring districts for recruiting the staff. I think that would be a most disastrous course to take. If each district tries to poach on its neighbour there will soon be no supply in any district. It is difficult enough to get pupil teachers in the rural districts as it is, and, if the Board of Education enforce their own regulations, it will become more difficult, because the Board have in the Code a theoretical rule, that pupil teachers should only be allowed in schools where they could be well trained, and where the size of the staff and the school are such as to render it possible to train them. There are many rural schools, therefore, which cannot possibly have pupil teachers. I am quite sure that the only way in which you will get pupil teachers under any conditions similar to those that now prevail in the regulations will be through cheap secondary schools, by founding small scholarships and getting the promising children from the elementary schools to come in, as day scholars it may be, on the understanding that if they spend a couple of years in these schools they will pass on to become pupil teachers.

Lord Stanley of Alderley.

The problem in the rural districts is quite a different one from that in the towns. I do not want to go into controversial matters to-night, but merely to contribute a few practical suggestions. I agree with the noble Marquess that it would be a pity, when he gives more liberal grants, to earmark them for this or that. The habit of earmarking grants is a mischievous one; it makes local authorities think they are only to teach that for which they are paid. The trouble is that under the present law there is no duty imposed upon any local authority with reference to the training or preparation of pupil teachers. Previous to the Cockerton judgment the duty of instructing pupil teachers was one of the obligations of the Code, failure to perform which would have led the Board of Education to declare the school board authority in default; but it was declared in that judgment that it was illegal for them to perform the duty of giving this instruction. The Government might, if they had chosen, have corrected that peculiar decision by indicating that the training of pupil teachers should be a part of the duty of the authority charged with elementary education. It would then have come under the elementary rate, which is not limited in amount; but instead of that, they declared that it should be a branch of secondary education. Moreover, by turning children out of the elementary schools at fifteen and not taking them as pupil teachers till they are sixteen you run the risk of a gap in the school career which will make you lose many promising candidates. But the rights of local authorities under the secondary education part of the Act are permissive, and carry with them no duties. No school managers can call upon the local authority to do one atom for the teaching of pupil teachers, because that is a branch of secondary education which is discretionary and not compulsory. The difficulties, as I have said, are very great, and I think the Board of Education will do well to put forward some further Memorandum indicating how they suggest that local authorities should battle with this question, because it is a serious one and one on which some help from the Board of Education will be useful.

EARL SPENCER: My Lords, there was one remark made by the noble Marquess which I should like to correct. He rather twitted our side of the House by saying he did not think we were aware of the great importance of this pupil-teacher question. I protest against that. There are many Members on this side of the House who have taken a prominent part in education and who are fully cognisant of its great importance. For the new educational authorities the question is a serious one, and I think we ought to be very grateful to my noble friend for bringing the matter forward, for we have had a very useful and interesting discussion upon it. The speech of the noble Lord who spoke last was full of the information which he possesses almost more than anyone else on this subject, and we ought to thank him very much for his contribution to the discussion. I venture to say that in connection with this subject there is no question now so important as an increase of places where teachers and pupil teachers can be properly trained.

At this moment thee ducation of pupil teachers is relegated to secondary education. In many counties we have hardly been able to develop that at all, and the consequence is that there is an almost entire blank from the old system to the new with regard to the instruction of pupil teachers. One thing has been brought out most clearly to-night, and I think it is fully appreciated by the noble Marquess, and that is, that in considering this great subject—and it will have to be considered in great detail—it must be remembered that there is a great difference between rural and urban requirements. I am afraid from what I have seen, and from the little experience I have had in this matter lately, that some of the regulations put forward—I am not sure that they have not been somewhat modified since—did impose severe terms with regard to pupil teachers' centres which would very greatly add to the difficulties surrounding this subject, particularly in rural districts. The noble Lord who spoke last made what was no doubt a very wise suggestion with regard to that. I think the debate has been a useful one, and will impress upon the noble Marquess the great difficulties there are connected with this important subject, and I trust that the Board of Education will take all these matters that have been referred to into consideration, and will give such assistance to the local authorities as will enable them to supply what is so much needed, a greater number of teachers and also of pupil teachers.

RE-VACCINATION BILL [H.L.].

Amendment reported (according to order).

House adjourned at ten minutes before Six o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 7th July, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.:—Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time to-morrow.

Birkdale Improvement Bill; Crystal Palace District Gas Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Clyde Valley Electrical Power Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments

Selby Urban District Council Bill. Read the third time, and passed. [New Title.]

Southport and Lytham Tramroad (Extension of Time) Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Leith Corporation Tramways Order Confirmation Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

Glasgow Corporation (Police) Order Confirmation Bill. Considered; to be read the third time upon Monday next.

Liverpool and Wigan Churches Bill [Lords]. Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time.

Portmadoc, Beddgelert, and South Snowdon Railway Bill [Lords]; North Wales Electric Power Bill [Lords]; Bristol Corporation Bill [Lords]; West Riding Tramways Bill [Lords]; Bournemouth Corporation (Tramways) Bill [Lords]; Holywood Tramways Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act for authorising the Urban District Council of Buxton to acquire from the Most Noble Spencer Compton, Duke of Devonshire, K.G., the Mineral Water Baths of Buxton, and to maintain and improve the same; and for other purposes." [Buxton Urban District Council Bill [Lords.]

Buxton Urban District Council Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; from Allendale and Catton; Appleton; Ashford; Axbridge; Aylesford; Banwell; Barnes and Mortlake; Blagdon; Boscastle; Bromley; Brown hills; Cheddar; Churchill; Colchester; Dover; Dunstable; East Brent; Eastwood; Edinburgh (two); Farnborough; Farnworth and Kearsley; Fulham; Glasgow; Gondhurst and Kilndown; Grandborough; Hartlepool; Heighington; Houghton; Huntingdon; Latchford; Lee and Lewisham; Little Lever; Luddenden (two); Lymm; Lympsham; Martinscroft; Mitcham; Moore; Newcastle-on-Tyne (two); New Shildon; North Shields; Padgate; Penryn; Reading; Reddish; Rugeley; Salford; Sandford; Saltburn by the Sea; Seghill; Shelf; Shildon (three); Shipham; Southport; South Shields (two); Stockton Heath (two); Stockton-on-Tees; Sydenham; Tamerton Folliott; Toddington; Ubley; Warminster; Warrington (two); Wedmore; West Hartlepool; West Streatham; Whitley; and, Wrington; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petition from Scarborough, against restriction of Debate; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petition from Sudbury, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

PORT OF LONDON BILL.

Petition of the Conservators of the River Thames, against; to lie upon the Table.

VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS ACT, 1897.

Petitions for alteration of Law; from Banbury; and Scarborough; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of Minute of the Board of Education, dated 7th July, 1904, modifying Code of Regulations for Public Elementary Schools, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ISLE OF MAN.

Account presented, of Revenue and Expenditure for the year ended 31st March, 1904, with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 241.]

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3207 and 3208 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION (IRELAND) (OFFICIALS).

Return ordered, "Of officials employed upon the 1st day of June, 1904, by the various county boroughs and urban councils in Ireland in carrying out the provisions of the Technical Instruction (Ireland) Act, in the following form:—

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.
Name.	Description of office.	Salary.	Date of appointment.	Previous employment.	Tenure of office.

(*Mr. Joyce.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Electricity in Mines.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, seeing that the recommendations of the Electricity in Mines Departmental Committee are in some respects opposed to the latest practice adopted by the electrical engineers of corporation and traction companies, and are therefore opposed by engineers, he will, to expedite the passing of a uniform set of rules, ask the Coalowners' and Miners' Associations to form a joint committee to agree to the main recommendations of this Committee which are not the subject of any serious controversy.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) I am not aware that the Committee's recommendations are opposed to the latest practice of the engineering profession. One of the members of the Committee was a distinguished engineer, and the Committee received very great assistance from that profession in their inquiry. I do not propose to delay the establishment of the rules by referring them to a further committee as suggested. The rules have been for some time under the consideration of the Owners' Association assisted by a number of electrical engineers, and the communications received lead me to hope that, subject to modifications on some minor points, the recommendations generally of the Committee (on which I may add the miners were ably represented) will be accepted.

MR. MARKHAM: To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, seeing that the Electricity in Mines Committee recommended that the application of special electrical rules should be left in the hands of His Majesty's Inspectors of Mines, he will, in view that most of the inspectors have had no practical experience whatever of electrical work, ask the House to vote the necessary money to enable him to appoint a sufficient number of electrical inspectors so that an inspection could be made by these inspectors at least once a year at all collieries where electrical plant is installed; and will he say how many deaths occurred last year in mines and shafts due to electricity.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) The view of the Committee was that the enforcement of these, as of all other special rules, should be left in the hands of the inspectors of mines, and I agree with that view. The appointment of special inspectors for the purpose would be undesirable. If, however, as the matter proceeds, it should appear that there is any necessity for it, I shall be prepared to consider the possibility of giving the inspectors the assistance of expert advice in the matter. The number of deaths last year in mines from electric shock was four.

Labourers' Cottage Schemes in Ireland.

MR. O'SHEE (Waterford, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, in reference to how many estates inquiries have been made under Section 96 of the Land Act of 1903 with respect to accommodation for labourers; how many schemes have been framed, or are about to be framed, by the Land Commission providing therefor; how many of such schemes have been forwarded to the Local Government Board and the rural district councils; what are the names of the estates and the counties dealt with in such schemes; and whether the Estates Commissioners will consider the desirability of having inquiries made from the labourers themselves, as well as from other persons on each estate inspected.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The number of estates inspected and reported on to the present date is 365; 250 of these have been before the Estates Commissioners for their consideration and ruling, but the remainder have not yet reached that stage. Schemes have been framed in the case of ten estates, and representations in respect of them will be forwarded in due course to the Local Government Board and rural district councils concerned. The ten estates referred to are as follows:—

Perrin-Hatchell, county Wexford.
Sir G. Morris, county Galway.
Earl FitzWilliam, county Wicklow.
W. H. Sinclair, county Tyrone.
M. J. Sullivan, county Kilkenny.
J. C. Wood, county Cork
E. S. Parke, county Waterford.
G. P. Colley, county Kildare.
H. V. Brooke, county Down.
W. C. Moore, county Wexford.

The inspectors are instructed to make their inquiries locally and of all such persons as they may consider to be in a position to enable them to form an opinion.

Cruelty to Horses in Mines—Visits of Home Office Inspectors.

MR. BROOKE ROBINSON (Dudley): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that during the Committee stage of The Coal Mines Regulation Act, 1887, words were inserted requiring the Government inspector to examine and inquire into the case of animals used in the mine; whether his attention has been drawn to a case of continuous cruelty to a number of horses in a mine at Fenton, in North Staffordshire, belonging to the Staffordshire Coal and Iron Company, in which, upon a prosecution by Mr. Colam at the instance of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty, at Longton, last Wednesday, the stipendiary magistrate, in sentencing the manager of the mine to two months imprisonment with hard labour, expressed his surprise that any Government official could go into the pit and not see the condition of these horses; whether the Home Office have received reports showing that the mine inspectors throughout the country are actively carrying out the provisions of the Act in connection with animals; and can he say how many, if any, prosecutions for cruelty have been instituted at the instance of a Government inspector.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) The case to which I understand my hon. friend to refer was reported to me by the Inspector of Mines last month, and I at once instructed the Treasury solicitor to take proceedings. Before they were instituted, however, the inspector learnt that the matter had already been taken up by the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. He reported this to me, stating that he thought it would be best to await the result of these proceedings. The magistrate, I imagine, could not have been aware of these facts when he made the remarks mentioned in the Question. Instructions are given to inspectors of mines to examine into the care and treatment of horses. I have every reason to believe that these instructions are obeyed. During the last three years seventy-seven prosecutions have been taken for cruelty to animals in mines; of these twenty-five were proceedings by inspectors, in the remainder the proceedings were taken by the owners of the mines.

Pay of Season Substitutes at Bristol Telegraph Office.

MR. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe): To ask the Postmaster-General whether, seeing that in 1903 season substitutes in the Telegraph Office, Bristol, were paid at the rate of 27s. per week for the men and 20s. per week for women, he will explain why for the current season the men are being paid 18s. per week and the women 15s. per week.

(*Answered bg Lord Stanley.*) At Bristol last year it was necessary to employ several qualified assistants pending a revision of the staff (which has since been authorised), and exceptionally high rates of pay had to be given to secure experienced officers, but the high rates mentioned were not paid in every case. This year, however, no such conditions exist, and the wages paid are sufficient to obtain the services of the few persons temporarily required.

Overtime in Ludgate Circus Post Office.

MR. HORNER (Lambeth, N.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the counter clerks and telegraphists stationed at the Ludgate Circus Post Office were asked to volunteer for overtime from midnight until 3 a.m. as a temporary measure during the pressure occasioned by the South African War; and that since the conclusion of the war the men have still been kept on until 3 a.m. although they have asked to be relieved; and, if so, whether, in view of the fact that the inspector has now ordered the staff to perform 7.45 p.m. to 3 a.m. duty, he will investigate the circumstances of the case.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) I am aware of the circumstances at the Ludgate Circus Office to which the Member for Lambeth refers. It is necessary for the office to be kept open for telegraph business until 3 a.m. on five nights a week, but arrangements are already being made for the overtime to be abolished, and for the additional attendance beyond midnight to form part of a regular and continuous duty.

Charges for Letters addressed to Cromer Post Office.

MR. BROADHURST (Leicester): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that persons sending for their letters to the Cromer Post Office are charged threepence for a single letter and one penny for every additional ten letters; and, if so, will he say whether this system exists in any other post offices, and, if so, whether he will take steps to withdraw these charges.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) I fear that there has been some misapprehension at the Cromer Post Office respecting the rules as to the delivery of letters to callers. I will have the matter put right at once.

Zanzibar—Direction of Affairs during Sultan's Minority.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what arrangements are in force for the direction of affairs at Zanzibar during the Sultan's minority; whether a deputation recently came to England to complain to the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the proceedings of the Regent; and, if so, whether the complaints were inquired into.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) The affairs of Zanzibar are directed during the Sultan's minority by the first Minister of His Highness's Government acting as Regent. His Majesty's Government have been in correspondence with the Sultan and Regent in regard to various questions recently raised by His Highness's Envoy.

Whitstable Charities—Alleged Misuse of Endowment.

MR. SLACK (Hertfordshire, St. Albans): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether by letter dated 12th March, 1903, the Board of Education requested the Charity Commissioners to divert an endowment properly payable to the Kent education authority for the payment of teachers' salaries at Whitstable, in that county, and appropriate it to the payment of debts incurred or about to be incurred by the trustees of the Whitstable and Seasalter National School; and, if so, whether the Board of Education will inform the Charity Commissioners that they now desire that the endowment shall be paid to the local education authority, as directed by Section 13 of the Education Act, 1902, and that if the managers of that school wish to enlarge the school-house such enlargement shall be carried out by means of funds provided by the managers, as directed by Section 7 of the same Act.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) On the 12th March, 1903, the Board requested the Charity Commissioners to take up the conduct of the case, which was one of a "mixed charity," and therefore subject to the jurisdiction of the Commissioners. The Board at the same time expressed the opinion that it was desirable that the trustees' proposal with respect to the improvement of the school buildings, and the arrangement for the repayment of any loan which might be raised for the purpose, should be laid before the local education authority. This having been duly done by the trustees, and the scheme having been communicated by the Commissioners to the urban district council, with the result that no objection was raised during the period of publication, which expired on the 27th May last, and expenditure having now proceeded on the faith of the sanction of the Commissioners, the Board do not consider that they can intervene in the manner suggested. No difference between the local education authority and the trustees with reference to the application of the income of the endowment has been referred to the Board under the provisions of Section 13 (1) of The Education Act, 1902.

Delay in Erection of National School at Knocknagin.

MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what is the cause of the delay in sanctioning the erection of the proposed national school at Knocknagin, county Derry, considering that some months ago the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland promised the reverend manager that they then expected shortly to be able to give a definite answer on the subject.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) In this case the manager elected to postpone the erection of the building pending a decision on the question of the revision of the plans and estimates for schoolhouses, in respect to which I would refer to the statement made by my hon. friend the Financial Secretary to the Treasury on the 26th May last year.†

Police House-to-house Visits in the Moy District.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will explain by whose authority, and for what reason, the police are going from house to house in the district of Moy, county Tyrone, demanding the names of persons connected with the Orange Society.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The inquiries made by the police had reference to the contemplated movements of the different bands and drumming parties on 1st and 12th instant, to enable arrangements to be made for the preservation of the peace on those dates. Such inquiries are usual, but no inquiries of the character mentioned in the Question were made.

Distribution of Guns captured in the South African and Chinese Wars.

MR. COGHILL (Stoke-upon-Trent): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the London County Council have refused the offer of the War Office of some of the guns captured in the South African and Chinese Wars; and whether he has made, or will make, a similar offer to some of the provincial towns.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The allotment of guns captured in the South African and Chinese Wars was made in accordance with the recommendations of a Committee, which duly weighed the claims of units and of public bodies to these trophies. No letter has been received in the War Office from the London County Council refusing the guns allotted to that body; but, should such refusal be received, the guns would be allotted to some other town within the boundary of the 4th Army Corps.

Reconstruction of Queen Anne's Bounty Fund.

MR. H. C. RICHARDS (Finsbury, E.): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he will, at an early date next session, bring in the promised Bill for the reconstruction of the Queen Anne's Bounty Fund administration and its amalgamation with the Ecclesiastical Commission.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) I certainly hope that the time may be found next session for proceeding with this measure.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxii., 1791.

ORDER OF QUESTIONS.

MR. COGHILL (Stoke-upon-Trent) asked Mr. Speaker how it was that a Question which he had put down to the Secretary for War, and which stood No. 1 on the Order-book, had that day been placed No. 42. He knew that it was the practice to put all Questions to the Prime Minister late in the sitting, but he thought it extremely inconvenient that the Questions to other Ministers should be moved about in that way.

*MR. SPEAKER said that when the new rule as to "Questions" was settled two years ago it was suggested by the First Lord of the Treasury, with the general assent of the House, that the Questions should be so arranged as to ensure that those addressed to Ministers specially busy in their Departments should be placed near the end of the list, and the Secretary for War was one of those Ministers who had been deemed to be entitled to this consideration.

MR. COGHILL: Could not the change be made earlier? I find my Question stood No. 1 in the Order-book this morning.

*MR. SPEAKER: I will inquire as to that.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Warrant Officers and Navigating Duties.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the warrant officers who have successfully passed through a course of navigation under the new Admiralty scheme are being, or will be, appointed to ships on which they will have navigating duties.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): This new course is of such recent institution that no vacancy has yet occurred to which any of the small number of warrant officers who have passed through it could be appointed. They will, however, be considered for appointment to any vacancies as they occur.

Felixstowe Martello Tower.

MR. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether certain land, the property of the War Department, on which a Martello tower stands, at Felixstowe, has recently been sold; whether it was sold by public tender; and, if not, will he explain why; and whether, in the case of the sale of similar land, the War Office will offer the same for sale by public auction.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Mr. BROMLEY-DAVENPORT, Cheshire, Macclesfield): As a general rule sale by public tender is resorted to, but in the present case an expert adviser considered that the circumstances were not favourable for public sale, the market being somewhat depressed. The price realised by private negotiation was very largely in excess of any reserve which would have been put upon the land in view of its actual market value.

Ball and Dummy Cartridges.

MR. COGHILL (Stoke-upon-Trent): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he has now received any report as to the circumstances under which William Hill, of Fenton, a private in the 4th Battalion North Staffordshire Militia, met his death recently at Lichfield; and whether his attention has been called to the recommendation of the jury at the inquest that in future a distinction should be made between dummy and ball cartridges.

MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: A report has been received from the General Officer commanding the North-Western District, from which it appears that it is not possible to state definitely how this round of ball cartridge got into the bag containing dummy cartridges. As regards preventing a recurrence of this regrettable accident, inquiry is being made as to whether the distinction which now exists between ball and dummy cartridges cannot be made more marked. Orders have also been issued enjoining greater care in the issue and return of unexpended ball ammunition.

MR. COGHILL: Will any compensation be made to the relatives of Private Hill?

MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: I must ask the hon. Member to give notice of that Question.

Chinese Labourers for the Transvaal.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, if he will state how many men, women, and children respectively formed the second party of Chinese who have lately embarked for the Transvaal.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. LYTTELTON, Warwick and Leamington): I am informed that 1,971 emigrants sailed on the "Ikbal"; no women and children; eleven registered married. 1,988 sailed on the "Swanleigh"; no women and children; 394 registered married men.

Maltese Balance-Sheet.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in view of the fact that three months have elapsed since the close of the financial year in Malta, he will undertake that a copy of the balance-sheet for the year will be available for Members of the House before the Vote on the Colonial Estimates is taken.

MR. LYTTELTON: I have communicated the hon. Member's Question to the Governor of Malta, but pending the receipt of his reply, which I have requested him to furnish by telegraph, I am unable to state at what date the financial statements for the year ending 31st March last will be ready.

The Operations in Tibet.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): Have His Majesty's Government any further news from Tibet.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): Is there any information as to what the approximate losses of the enemy were.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): I telegraphed this morning to the Government of India, but I have not yet received from them any account of the operations yesterday at Gyangtse, nor have I yet heard from them whether the account published in the newspapers is correct.

MR. LOUGH: Will the right hon. Gentleman inform the House on the adjournment?

MR. BRODRICK: Certainly, if I have any information.

Seizure of the "Allanton."

SIR CHARLES CAYZER (Barrow-in-Furness): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can now state the reasons given by the Russian Prize Court at Vladivostock for the confiscation of the British steamer "Allanton" and her cargo; and, if not, when he will be able to give the information.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl PERCY, Kensington, S.): His Majesty's Ambassador at St. Petersburg has asked the Russian Government for an official statement of the grounds upon which the vessel and her cargo were condemned. The information, when furnished, will at once be communicated to the parties interested.

MR. WOLFF (Belfast, E.) asked if the grounds for the decision were the passage of the vessel through the Japanese Sea, instead of the Pacific, the presence on board of a Japanese cabin boy, the absence of proof that the Japanese company had sold the coal to a neutral party, and that the Judge was convinced that the steamer was not bound to Singapore, but to a Japanese or Korean port.

EARL PERCY said he should like to have notice of that Question.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN (Kilkenny, N.): Has any protest been sent by the British Foreign Office to St. Petersburg

EARL PERCY: There can be no question of protesting until we have the official statement.

Pemba Freed Slave's Appeal.

MR. BAYLEY (Derbyshire, Chesterfield): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he has received the report giving the result of the appeal by the freed slave Mshangama against the judgment of Mr. J. P. Farler, the Zanzibar Government Slavery Commissioner at Pemba, in the case of an action brought against Mshangama by his former master; and, if so, is he in a position to communicate that result.

EARL PERCY: The judgment delivered by Assistant Judge Skinner Turner, who held the inquiry into the case on appeal, has been received. He holds that the interpretation of the Decree of 1897 never came into the case and sees no reason to reverse the decision of the Collector either as to his facts or his law.

MR. BAYLEY: Will the noble Lord lay on the Table a copy of the judgment?

EARL PERCY: I should like to have notice of that.

Expenditure on the East African and Uganda Protectorates.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if, in view of the fact that the Estimates, Class 5, Vote 2, only show the gross sums necessary for the East Africa and Uganda Protectorates, he will supply more detailed Estimates for the use of Members of the House.

EARL PERCY: No, Sir. The Estimates are presented in the same form as the Estimates for the protectorates which are under the control of the Colonial Office and it is not proposed to alter the existing practice.

MR. BUCHANAN: They are not Estimates but merely a statement of the grant in-aid.

Collection of New Taxes.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether Section 18 of the Customs Law Consolidation Act, 1876 (which provides that when new duties of Customs are imposed former ones are to continue until the new become chargeable) is held to justify Collecting Departments in enforcing new taxes from the date of the Vote in the Committee of Ways and Means imposing the same; and, if so, whether this interpretation extends to all new taxes, whether duties of Customs or not; and whether there has ever been any judicial decision to this effect.

MR. CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): Section 18 of the Customs Consolidation Act, 1876, relates to the Customs only. It contains a statutory recognition of the practice of collecting new duties of Customs imposed by Resolution of the House of Commons from such date as is provided by the Resolution. The practice itself rests on ancient usuage in regard to Customs and Excise duties. The procedure is the same with regard to the collection of income-tax which is a tax annually imposed; but it has never been extended to stamp duties. The hon. Member will find an interesting note on the subject on page 556 of the tenth edition of "May's Parliamentary Practice." There has not been any judicial decision on the subject.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Will the right hon. Gentleman give the words of Section 18 on which he relies.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: If the hon. Gentleman will be good enough to look at the Act he will find them in a moment.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I have looked at the Act and I am puzzled to know on what words the right hon. Gentleman relies.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I am afraid I can add nothing to my Answer.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Does the Act give statutory protection for this collection of Customs duties only.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Yes, the section refers to Customs duties only. The practice has not been applied to the stamp duties, but it has to the Excise.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Will the hon. Gentleman consider the propriety of introducing into the Finance Bill some clause giving statutory authority.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! Notice must be given of that.

Irish Excursion Trains --Lack of Sanitary Accommodation.

MR. JORDAN (Fermanagh, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that an excursion train, with about 600 members and their friends of the Catholic confraternity, left Enniskillen on the morning of the 3rd inst. for Dublin, upwards of 120 miles, and returning on the evening of the same day; and that on that train, crowded with passengers of all ages and both sexes, there was no lavatory nor sanitary accommodation whatever; and, in view of the comfort and health of the excursionists carried by this line to and from all points thereof, will he continue his good offices to rectify this state of affairs.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): I have no information on the subject other than that supplied me by the hon. Member himself, but I am directing the attention of the railway company to the complaint contained in his Question.

Borough Recorders and the Licensing Bill.

SIR ALBERT ROLLIT (Islington, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he has arrived at any determination as to omitting in Clause 7, Sub-section (2), of the Licensing Bill, the proviso that the recorder of a county borough, having a separate Court of quarter sessions, must be a member and chairman of any committee of the justices.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): Yes, Sir; I propose to omit from the Bill the provision as to the recorder of a county borough, to which my hon. friend refers.

Motor-Cars in London Streets—Speed Regulations.

MR. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Local Government Board whether any suggestions have been made to him by the authorities in control of the London street traffic to regulate the speed of motor-cars in crowded thoroughfares.

THE SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. GRANT LAWSON, Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk): An application has been made by the Corporation of the City of London for a regulation restricting the speed of motor-cars within the City to ten miles an hour, and this is now under consideration. No application of the kind has been received as regards the rest of London, nor have suggestions been made to the Department on the subject by the authorities concerned.

Cheshire County Council and Non-provided School Teachers' Agreements.

MR. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether his attention has been called to the circular issued by the Director of Education of the Cheshire County Council, on 2nd May, 1904, stating that the Director of Education is authorised to withhold his consent, on behalf of the committee, to all agreements entered into between the managers of non-provided schools and teachers in such schools, unless such agreements are on the form prescribed by this committee; that all advertisements for teachers in elementary schools in the county elementary education area are to be forwarded for him to insert into suitable papers, and that no advertisements are to be issued otherwise; and, if so, whether, in view of the provisions of the Education Act, 1902, with regard to the appointment of the principal or assistant teachers in non-provided schools, he will state whether he proposes to take any, and, if so, what action in the matter.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University): This matter is plainly one as to which managers, if they are aggrieved by the action of the local education authority, have an appeal to the Board of Education, under Section 7 (3) of the Education

Act of 1902. Under these circumstances, the hon. Member will see that I could not without impropriety answer his Question within the terms in which it is framed.

*Mr. BOLAND: May I ask whether, as a matter of fact, an appeal has been lodged in this case.

Sir WILLIAM ANSON: I am not sure whether any appeal has been lodged in this case, but it has been done in similar cases.

Delay in Granting Probates in Dublin.

Mr. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland if he can explain the cause of the delay in the granting of probates at the principal registry of the probate division in Dublin.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.): I am not aware that there is any delay. There are no arrears, and I am informed that yesterday the clerks in the office were engaged in drawing up the grants on applications lodged the same day. If the hon. Member will furnish me with information as to any particular case in which delay is alleged to have occurred, I will inquire into it.

Irish Land Purchase—Kenmare Estate.

Mr. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Estates Commissioners and the Congested Districts Board have been written to by tenants on the Kenmare Estate, county Kerry, intimating that the landlord had expressed his readiness to sell his estate, and asking them to open up negotiations for the purchase of same; and, if so, will he say whether it has been and will continue to be the practice of the Estates Commissioners and the Congested Districts Board not to take any steps in such circumstances until the landlord communicates directly with them.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Wyndham, Dover): The Congested Districts Board has received no communication from the tenants. The Estates Commissioners have, and the tenants were informed that no application for sale had been received from the owner. I do not know what the hon. Member means by "any steps." Neither the Board nor the Commissioners can take any effective administrative steps in respect of purchase until an owner has, at any rate, commenced overtures for sale.

Mr. MURPHY: I may inform the right hon. Gentleman that in this case the landlord is willing to sell and the tenants are willing to buy. I want to know if either of these Boards will now move in the matter.

Mr. WYNDHAM said it was for the parties to take the first step.

Children's Courts in Ireland.

Mr. HUGH LAW (Donegal, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what arrangements have yet been made for the establishment of children's Courts in Dublin, Cork, and Belfast respectively; and when the Courts will be opened for the trial of child prisoners.

Mr. WYNDHAM: In Dublin and Belfast arrangements have already been made for the separate hearing of juvenile custody cases without bringing them into contact with adult offenders. In Cork, similar arrangements will be made when the by-laws regulating street trading by children are confirmed. These by-laws are now before the Lord-Lieutenant.

Mr. SLOAN: When will the Belfast Court be opened?

Mr. WYNDHAM: It is already open.

Carnane Estate, County Limerick.

Mr. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that within the past few months some sixty labourers and farmers in the parish of Fedamore, county Limerick, petitioned the Estates Commissioners requesting them to buy the Carnane Estate in that parish, and resell it in small lots to the labourers and small farmers around; and whether, seeing that the districts adjacent, Skule and Clodhadoloorte, are, for the most part, cut-out bog, and are highly congested, he can hold forth any hope to the parties interested that the Estates Commissioners will endeavour to buy this estate.

MR. WYNDHAM: There is some difficulty in identifying this estate on the information given in the Question. Perhaps the hon. Member will amend it by inserting the name of the owner.

Kinvara Pier and Harbour.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the condition of the pier and harbour of Kinvara, county Galway; and whether, seeing that the county council are prepared to advance a certain amount of money towards the work, he will try to have the promises made by the Lord-Lieutenant and the Congested Districts Board, and also the sum promised under the Marine Works Act, fulfilled, so that this work may be taken in hand as soon as possible.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am aware of the condition of the harbour works at Kinvara. There are certain legal matters connected with the proposed expenditure on the works that are engaging the consideration of the Government, and I hope a decision will soon be arrived at.

MR. JOYCE: It is badly wanted.

Major Fox's Estate—Ballymacrossin, King's County.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the estate of Major Fox, Ballymacrossin, King's county, is being sold to the tenants, and that Miss Masterson (who is living in a wooden hut in the locality) was evicted out of a farm of 200 acres on the property in 1884; and whether he can state what provision is being made for the restoration of this evicted tenant to her holding.

MR. WYNDHAM: The estate of Major Fox is before the Estates Commissioners. They have also received an application from the evicted tenant named, which will be duly considered.

MR. DELANY: When will the result be known?

MR. WYNDHAM: I cannot forecast that.

Land Purchase in Tipperary—Thomas Dowling's Estate.

MR. KENDAL O'BRIEN (Tipperary, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Daniel Moran, of Cappawhite, county Tipperary, a tenant on the estate of Thomas Dowling, which is in the Land Judge's Court for sale, offered twenty years purchase of his rent for his holding, which consists of a farm of about ten acres, of which he is a judicial tenant, and the same number of years purchase for his house and premises in Cappawhite, of which he is a yearly tenant; that his offer has been refused, and proceedings threatened by writ for the recovery of arrears of rent; and that it is proposedto sell the agricultural portion of the estate to the tenants, and the portion forming the village of Cappawhite to the incumbrancer; and, if so, whether the Estates Commissioners will, seeing that the tenants in the village live chiefly by farming the agricultural portion of their holdings, refuse their sanction to the proposed sale until an offer of sale is made of the whole estate to the tenants.

MR. KENDAL O'BRIEN: I beg also to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been drawn to the proceedings in the Land Judge's Court in the matter of the estate of Thomas Dowling, and to the order made by the Judge on the application of the solicitor having carriage, whereby the offer of the agricultural tenants to purchase their holdings at twenty-and-a-half years purchase was accepted, and the request that had been issued to the Estates Commissioners to inspect the whole estate (part being held by agricultural tenants and part consisting of the village of Cappawhite) was ordered to be withdrawn, on the ground that the incumbrancer represented by the solicitor having carriage of the sale was disposed to purchase the village himself; and whether, in view of the fact that the greater number of the tenants in the village are also tenants on the agricultural portion of the estate, and of the effect upon these tenants of the withdrawal of the whole estate from the jurisdiction of the Estates Commissioners and splitting up the same for sale, the Estates Commissioners will, on the application of the tenants of the village of Cappawhite, order an inspection of it, with a view to its purchase and resale to the tenants.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Estates Commissioners understand that the Dowling Estate, for sale in the Land Judge's Court, consists partly of agricultural holdings and partly of the village of Cappawhite. They also understand that all the agricultural tenants, except Daniel Moran, have agreed to purchase their holdings on terms which the solicitor having carriage is prepared to recommend for acceptance to the Land Judge. Under these circumstances the Estates Commissioners considered that there was nothing to be gained by the issue of a request which could apply only to the village of Cappawhite, and accordingly withdrew the request.

Drainage of the Owenmore.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any portion of the Development Grant Fund will be allocated for river drainage purposes in Ireland; and, if so, whether a small grant from that fund will be given for the drainage of the Owenmore.

MR. WYNDHAM: Provision is made in the Development Grant Estimate for a charge in respect of the drainage of the Bann, the reasons for which I have explained. I am not prepared to impose on the Estimate any additional charge for the purposes of arterial drainage.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): Can the right hon. Gentleman give us any information as to the Estimate.

MR. WYNDHAM: It is being prepared.

Irish Schoolhouse Plans.

MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what is the cause of the delay on the part of the Government in sanctioning the revised plans and estimates for schoolhouses in Ireland; and if, considering the loss entailed for primary education by reason of this delay, he will take steps to have the plans approved of forthwith.

MR. WYNDHAM: The reasons for the delay have been explained by my hon. friend the Financial Secretary to the Treasury. I would refer to his statement on the 26th May last year.†

Police Constable Molloy, Royal Irish Constabulary.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the district inspector has any explanation to offer of the fact that he did not report the conduct of Police Constable Molloy, as disclosed at the Coleraine Petty Sessions, until after the matter had been raised in this House; and whether he can state why Molloy was not censured immediately after he had threatened one of the witnesses.

MR. WYNDHAM: The constable, as I have already stated, used no threat towards the witness, and the district inspector considered it unnecessary, therefore, to make a report of the occurrence.

MR. MACVEAGH: When the report was made why did not the inspector act on it.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am not prepared to deal in detail with minor questions of discipline, as I have the greatest confidence in the Inspector-General.

Valentia Ferry.

MR. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the fact that improved facilities for the ferry at Valentia, county Kerry, are urgently required, and of the forecast of expenditure under the Marine Works Act which was made with regard to it, he will state in what respect conditions have so changed that no scheme of improvement is now being pushed forward.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxii., 1791.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am afraid I have no further information to give in the matter beyond that already supplied by me in answer to previous Questions† by the hon. Member.

United States Duties on Irish Fish.

MR. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has any, and if so what, official information as to the withdrawal by the United States Government of the increased duty on imported Irish mackerel.

MR. WYNDHAM: I gave this information in reply to a Question yesterday by the hon. Member for West Kerry.‡

Land Purchase in County Donegal—Case of George Ward.

MR. HUGH LAW: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state why the Congested Districts Board decided not to purchase the estate on which the holding from which George Ward, of Tuberkeen, Dungloe, county Donegal, was evicted is situated.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Board failed to come to terms with the owner.

MR. HUGH LAW: Are there any means of getting this man reinstated.

MR. WYNDHAM: I can only refer the hon. Member to my statements on this point last year in the Land Bill debates.

Kingston Estate, County Cork.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that police constables have been and are daily engaged visiting the homes of tenants on the Kingston Estate, inquiring whether the tenants have agreed to purchase, if they are pleased with the terms, and the acreage, rent, and valuation of their farms, a note of the answers being taken down in writing; that they have also visited the estate office to ascertain the number and names of the tenants who have signed agreements, and of those tenants who have refused to do so; and, if so, if he will state whether the police are acting under instructions by thus interfering in the negotiations and by exercising pressure on the tenants with a view of inducing acceptance of the agent's terms.

MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member has not been accurately informed. It is true that the police made inquiries in a friendly manner of the character referred to, but all such inquiries were made from tenants who had actually signed agreements for the purchase of their holdings and after negotiations had closed. The police did not interfere with these negotiations, nor did they exercise any pressure on tenants as suggested. As the hon. Member is aware, there have been many demands for statistical information in respect of sales under the Act of 1903, and the returns prepared by the police have facilitated the work of meeting these demands.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Does the right hon. Gentleman really think, with his knowledge of Ireland, that the police are the proper people to collect this information?

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes. I think they are; and when I am asked to obtain information I must do my best to get it. The police sometimes afford the only means.

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): But is not the information thus collected always coloured in accordance with the views of the Government?

MR. WYNDHAM: No, Sir.

Miltown-Malbay Petty Sessions Clerk.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will say whether, when Head Constable Allingham was recently elected petty sessions clerk at Miltown-Malbay, some of the magistrates of the district, including the chairman of the county council, who holds the Commission of the Peace, were not summoned to attend; and whether some of the magistrates who did attend, and voted for Head Constable

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxv., 1227.

‡ See page 794.

Allingham, were not entitled to sit on the Miltown-Malbay Bench on the occasion; and, if so, whether he will cause another election to be held, and have all the duly qualified magistrates of the petty sessions district summoned.

MR. WYNDHAM: Notices were sent by the clerk of the peace to every magistrate returned to him by the acting clerk of petty sessions as resident or in the habit of attending Miltown Petty Sessions. The chairman of the county council is not resident in the district. Some of the votes recorded at the election were not valid, but these were disregarded, and the head constable was found to have a majority of valid votes. The necessity for a fresh election does not, therefore, arise.

Tallow Police Force.

MR. O'SHEE (Waterford, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on Sunday, the 19th ult., the sergeant, Royal Irish Constabulary, at Tallow, county Waterford, requisitioned extra police from other stations; if so, will he state on what authority this was done, and why; whether anything in the nature of a public meeting was announced for or took place in Tallow or its neighbourhood on the occasion; and whether the county council of Waterford will be called upon to pay any part of the expense caused on the date mentioned by the action of this policeman.

MR. WYNDHAM: Four additional police arrived in Tallow on the date mentioned. They were ordered by the county inspector. No meeting was announced to be held and none was held. The men were drafted in from other stations in the county; the reply to the last query is consequently in the negative.

Labourers' Cottage Schemes in Ireland.

MR. O'SHEE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, in reference to how many estates inquiries have been made under Section 96 of the Land Act of 1903 with respect to accommodation for labourers; how many schemes have been framed, or are about to be framed, by the Land Commission providing therefor; how many of such schemes have been forwarded to the Local Government Board and the rural district councils; what are the names of the estates and the counties dealt with in such schemes; and whether the Estates Commissioners will consider the desirability of having inquiries made from the labourers themselves, as well as from other persons on each estate inspected.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am not yet in a position to reply to this Question; but I will communicate the information to the hon. Member in the course of an hour, and the reply will be printed on to-day's Votes.

Alleged Valuation Error at Dingle.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the holding of Thomas O'Donnell, Annascaul, Dingle, was valued at £5 beyond its true value through the mistake of the valuer; that he never knew of the increased valuation till he was asked to pay rates on it, when he refused and appealed to the county council; that there was no division or applotment in 1904, but a revision correcting the mistake of the valuer; whether, seeing that Mr. O'Donnell appealed on the first occasion this matter was brought to his notice, steps will be taken to have the amount which he was compelled unjustly to pay refunded to him.

MR. WYNDHAM: I explained the facts of this case in my reply to the hon. Member's previous Question of Monday last.† Public notice, in accordance with the statutory requirement, was given by the local authorities that the valuation lists were open for inspection. It is well known that such lists are open for inspection every year in March. Mr. O'Donnell failed to avail himself of his right of appeal, and there is no power now to re-open the case. It does not rest with the Government to order a refund in respect of rates; that is a matter for the local rating authority.

---

† See page 452.

Mr. THOMAS O'DONNELL: As this mistake was due to the neglect of an official, will the right hon. Gentleman see that the money is refunded?

Mr. WYNDHAM. I can add nothing to my Answer.

Millstreet Police Lodging-out Allowances.

Mr. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether Constable Ahern occupies that portion of the Millstreet police barrack known as the hospital; does his wife live in these apartments with him; is he one of the constables stated to be in receipt of a lodging-out allowance; and will he give the names of the two constables who live in the barrack and who are in receipt of lodging allowances.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The reply to the first two queries is in the affirmative, and to the third in the negative. The names of the two men referred to at the end of the Question are, Sergeant Crowley and Constable Smyth; the former has recently retired from the force.

Mr. SHEEHAN: Am I to understand that it is in accordance with the rules for a constable living in barracks with his wife to receive a lodging allowance?

Mr. WYNDHAM: I have said he does not.

Land Purchase in County Cavan—David Finlay's Estate.

Mr. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Irish Land Commission has been notified by tenant purchasers on the estate of David Finlay and others, near Bawnboy, in the county of Cavan, that the receivable orders which have been sent from its offices in Dublin have not been delivered to the tenants; and, if so, will he say who is responsible for their non-delivery.

Mr. VINCENT KENNEDY: I beg also to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a number of the tenants on the estate of David Finlay and others, near Bawnboy, in the county of Cavan (which is under the control of the Land Judge's Court), who have signed their purchase agreements, have been notified by the Irish Land Commission that their applications to purchase their holdings have been dismissed owing to delay; if so, will he state the cause of the delay; and, if the delay does not rest with the tenants, will they still be afforded an opportunity of completing their purchases.

Mr. WYNDHAM: On the 10th June thirteen applications for advances from tenants on this estate were dismissed by Mr. Commissioner O'Brien for delay in the conduct of the proceedings. The orders of dismissal have since been rescinded in six of these cases; five of which have been referred to the inspector for report and in the remaining case the advance has been sanctioned. No interest in lieu of rent is yet payable to the Land Commission in any of these cases, and consequently no receivable orders have been issued to the tenants. With respect to the seven cases in which the orders of dismissal have not been rescinded, the receiver has made a report to the Land Judge, who is in communication with the tenants' solicitor with a view to arranging, if possible, that they shall sign fresh applications, and also that all the remaining tenants shall also sign like applications for advance.

Learners in the Irish Postal Service.

Mr. VINCENT KENNEDY: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether the rule reducing the age limit from twenty-five to eighteen years in the case of girls seeking to enter the Post Office service in Ireland is intended to apply to learners who have almost completed the twelve months probation, and who, at the date of the making of the rule, were only a few months over the age limit; and whether, in view of the loss of time this rule will inflict on these girls and their parents, he will take steps to except such cases from the operation of the rule.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton): The maximum limit of age for admission as learners in the Post Office has been eighteen for some years, and this limit is retained in connection with the new arrangements for filling such situations generally by competition in Ireland. As in the past, assistants at sub-post offices will be eligible to take part in the limited competitions at Belfast, Cork, Dublin, Limerick, Londonderry, and Waterford, provided they have been continuously employed by the Post Office from a time when they were under twenty-five years of age.

Punishments in the Cork Post Office.

*MR. J. F. X. O'BRIEN (Cork): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware of the disparity in the punishments administered in the Cork Post Office; that for a mis-sent letter report, an officer was recently punished with two hours extra duty without pay; whilst for the loss of a remittance letter containing money, afterwards accidentally found, only nominal notice was taken; that for mis-sending two letters, a caution, in the surveyor's name, was recorded against an officer, and the same notice only was taken of a sorting clerk absent from duty for one day; that for an error of 1s. odd in the cast of a parcel list a sorting clerk was fined one day's pay, and cautioned in the Postmaster-General's name, whilst for an error of £10 in the preparation of a surcharge return on the part of another officer, no notice was taken; and, if so, whether he will consider the advisability of an investigation into the state of affairs at Cork Post Office by a trustworthy officer.

LORD STANLEY: I am not aware of the circumstances to which the hon. Member refers, but, with the exception of the caution in my name, all the punishments awarded were within the power of the local authorities to administer. They doubtless, in each case, took into consideration any special circumstances. I may add that in such cases I am unwilling to in any way interfere with the decisions of the local authorities, in whose fairness I have complete confidence.

*MR. J. F. X. O'BRIEN: Is the noble Lord aware that the system of espionage prevalent in the Cork Post Office is very irritating and causes a great deal of trouble?

LORD STANLEY: I am not aware of that, nor do I think it is so.

*MR. J. F. X. O'BRIEN: Will the noble Lord investigate the matter?

LORD STANLEY: No, Sir.

Kinvara (Galway) Letter Deliveries.

MR. JOYCE: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been called to the fact that there is only one mail delivery at 7 a.m. at Kinvara, county Galway; and whether, seeing the inconvenience to traders and others that this causes, he will have arrangements made for an evening delivery also.

LORD STANLEY: The question of affording a second delivery of letters at Kinvara, county Galway, has recently been under consideration, but I regret that, owing to the high cost of the existing arrangements, I should not be justified in sanctioning the additional expense which would be involved in providing the desired accomodation.

Pay of Limerick Postmen.

MR. JOYCE: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been called to the fact that the postmen employed at Limerick are not placed on an equal footing as regards pay with the postmen of other places where the work is the same; and, if so, will he give his attention to the matter, with a view of removing the alleged grievance.

LORD STANLEY: Postmen's wages are regulated mainly by the cost of living and value of labour in the locality. The pay of the Limerick postmen is the same as at other places where the conditions are similar.

MR. JOYCE: Arising out of that Answer, may I tell the noble Lord that the cost of living in Limerick is as high—especially in the matter of house rent—as in Cork. Will he consider this very real grievance?

[No Answer was returned.]

Trinity College, Dublin.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will give the Return asked for in the Order Paper this day relating to the revenues and method of government and administration of Trinity College, Dublin.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I have looked into this matter, and I find that in part the information asked for is to be found in the College Calendar published each year under the authority of the Board. Other information can be collected from the Report of the Royal Commission of 1853, and from two Returns, one of June 10th, 1874 (Incomes and Revenues) for each year (1869–1873), and from another Return of August 5th of 1889 (Incomes and Revenues). The revenues of the college, which, apart from fees, are mainly derived from land held by the college, are at present the subject of a reference to a Vice-regal Commission, which has just been appointed. Having regard to the information available from the sources indicated, it would appear that no useful object would be attained by granting the Return, which would entail very considerable expense, as it would necessitate practically the preparation of a volume of great length dealing with the whole question of University administration. I do not think I could with propriety ask the University authorities to furnish this material, as they have no staff or funds available for the purpose.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL asked whether the right hon. Gentleman was aware that since the last Report, issued in 1899, Trinity College had obtained something like £15,000 a year extra of public money.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR imagined that, if that were so, it must have been either for fees or land, and if it was for land it would be the subject of inquiry by the Vice-regal Commission, whose Report, no doubt, would be made public.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether it is within his knowledge that a Return with regard to revenues was given for the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge some time ago, and that no difficulty was raised by the authorities, and whether, if a good deal of the information asked for can be abstracted from the different Returns to which he has referred, it would be so difficult and costly to put it in a form which would be convenient to Members of the House and to others interested in Irish education. This is a matter of great interest not only to the people of Ireland, and it is almost impossible at present, except by very laborious investigation of these documents, to get even the elementary facts of the case.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I speak with very imperfect knowledge of the subject, but I conceive there would not be a serious difficulty in collating the information already available to the public. But that information would hardly be complete enough for the subject of a Parliamentary Return if, as I understand the case, there are other parts of the question in regard to which the difficulty I have referred to would make itself felt. I cannot add to what I have already said. I am told that it would be a costly and difficult thing, and in that case, and considering that there is a Commission investigating it, it seems premature, at all events, to ask the college to undertake this costly operation.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: But is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the Return for which I am asking is framed exactly on the one granted for Oxford and Cambridge.

*MR. SPEAKER: The right hon. Gentleman has said he cannot give the Return. The hon. Member cannot debate that Answer.

The Return referred to was as follows—

Trinity College, Dublin—Return of Revenues and Statement of method of government and administration, in the following form:—

(*a*) A Statement of the Revenues of the College, and of the sources from which they are derived.

(*b*) As to the Fellows of the College—

Their number; method of election; tenure of office; the duties and emoluments of each individual Fellow, and the sources from which these emoluments are derived; how many, and which of them, hold professorships or other offices.

(*c*) As to the Professors—

Their number; method of election; tenure of office; the duties and emoluments of each Professor; whence are those emoluments derived; how many, and which of them, hold other collegiate offices.

(*d*) A Statement of the method of government and administration of the College (distinguishing the duties of the Board and of the Academic Council), and of the number, duties, and salaries of the persons, other than servants, porters, etc., employed in the College.

(*e*) A Statement giving particulars as to the four professional schools, showing—

(1) The number of Professors and Teachers in each school.

(2) The emoluments received by each such Professor and Teacher.

(3) The fees paid in each school for professional instruction.

(*f*) A Statement giving particulars of the amount and employment of the Fund received as compensation for the Church livings of which the College was deprived in 1869, showing—

(1) The original amount of the Fund.

(2) The method of investment.

(3) The employment of the interest of the Fund.

(4) The present amount of the Fund.

(*g*) What provision is made for pensioning Fellows and Professors and other persons in the employment of the College. How many pensions have been granted since 1870. Age, employment, and cause of retirement of persons to whom such pensions have been granted. How many of such persons are now living.

Behring Sea Seal Fisheries—Despatch of a British Warship.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if His Majesty's Government have undertaken to send a British man-of-war to protect, against attack, the Russian possessions in the Pribyloff Islands, the Copper Islands, or other islands in the Behring Sea, or Russian property in seals on or about those islands; have they arranged with the Russian Government that this man-of-war shall coal at Petropavlovsk; if so, seeing that Russia is at war with Japan, and that Japan is consequently free to exercise her right of attacking, capturing, and confiscating any Russian territory or property, on what ground was the decision taken to intervene in the war by protecting Russian possessions or property against Japanese attacks; have His Majesty's Government taken the advice of the Law Officers of the Crown, and are they satisfied by that advice that such action does not constitute a breach of neutrality.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg also to ask the First Lord of the Treasury were conferences held at the Foreign Office in March and April as to the proposed defence of certain Russian islands and seal fisheries in the Behring Sea, between British, Canadian, and Russian delegates; if so, was any Japanese delegate present or invited to be present at those conferences; and, if not, why not; have His Majesty's Government applied for the assent of Japan to the interference of Great Britain for the defence of Russian territory and property against Japanese attacks; and, if so, when was their assent asked for and given; and, in view of the precedent thus to be set of action by a neutral Power, in derogation of the rights of war recognised by the Law of Nations, will the correspondence with Russia and Japan respectively, and an account of the conferences be laid upon the Table

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am quite ready to answer my hon. friend to-day on these two Questions; but would not his purpose be sufficiently satisfied if I were to assure him that any steps we have taken have been taken with the full knowledge and assent both of Russia and Japan, and that no international question can arise? If he wishes for more detailed information I will give it now.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: No, Sir; but perhaps the right hon. Gentleman can promise me the correspondence I have asked for. It does raise an intensely important question of international law, and if we could have the correspondence regarding that important question, that would entirely satisfy me.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think there is any correspondence upon the point in which the hon. Member is chiefly interested. I think he has asked these Questions under a mistake, but I will give him a full Answer. The first Question relates to certain islands. He is under a mistake in thinking that the Pribyloff Islands belong to Russia. As a matter of fact they belong to the United States. One of His Majesty's ships is about to proceed, as usual, to the Commander Islands, to enforce, under the Seal Fishery Act, 1893, so far as British vessels are concerned, the provisions of the agreement with Russia. This agreement was laid before Parliament in 1893. His Majesty's ship, as in former years, will be furnished with a supply of coal at Petropavlovsk. No jurisdiction will be exercised by His Majesty's ship over Japanese vessels, but the Japanese Government have requested that any raid may be reported to them and they will themselves deal with such case. No breach of neutrality can take place, and there has been no occasion to consult the Law Officers of the Crown. The action of His Majesty's Government has been taken at the request of Russia and Japan.

Sir Charles Eliot's Resignation—Conditions of Grant of Land to East African Syndicate.

Mr. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he will lay upon the Table of the House, either before or at the same time as the Papers connected with Sir Charles Eliot's resignation, the conditions on which 320 square miles of country has been granted or leased to the East African Syndicate; and what consideration the said syndicate has paid or has agreed to pay for same.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The Papers will be laid simultaneously.

The Statement on Army Reform.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: In reply to my Question yesterday the First Lord of the Treasury said he could not say what the business on Thursday next would be. But the newspapers appear to have been informed that the Army Estimates will be taken and that the Secretary of State for War will then make his statement. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman is now able to inform the House upon this subject.

Mr. WOLFF: And will the right hon. Gentleman make a statement at the same time as to the arrangement for Friday's business?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I have not seen the statement to which the right hon. Gentleman refers, but it has certainly not been made on the authority of His Majesty's Government. I think it not improbable that my right hon. friend will be able to make his statement on Thursday, but I must certainly not be held as committing myself at present to that arrangement of business. In reply to the hon. Member for Belfast the arrangement will be as I hinted yesterday. We shall take first the order of reference of the Labourers Bill to a Standing Committee. I hope that will not take long, so that we may then go on to the Land Bill.

The Aliens Bill.

Mr. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe) asked the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Minister in charge of the Aliens Bill took steps in the Grand Committee that day which practically amounted to its abandonment.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I have been informed that a Resolution was passed that in consequence, as I understand it, of the extraordinary prolongation of the proceedings in that Committee——

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): No such Resolution was passed.

Mr. WALLACE (Perth): It was withdrawn absolutely by the Minister.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I was asked the Question without notice, and I attempted to answer it with such information as I had. If that information is disputed, hon. Gentlemen had better put down a Question.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Does not the Minister in charge of the Bill act on the instructions of the Government?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The Minister in charge of the Bill is a member of the Cabinet, but so far as I know he acted in this respect as a member of Committee. But, again, perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will put a Question down.

MR. BLAKE (Longford, S.): I am sure the right hon. Gentleman on consideration will see that at the earliest moment practicable, at this period of the session, the House should be informed what the position of the Aliens Bill is.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! It is three o'clock.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: I desire to ask, Sir, whether the Chairman of the Aliens Bill Committee has not reported to the House.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. Swift MacNeill's "Orderly" Question.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL asked why a Question he had handed in at the Table, and which was perfectly in order, it having reference to the Motion on the Paper with regard to the dissolution of the present Parliament, had not appeared on the Paper.

*MR. SPEAKER: I have not the least idea, but I am delighted to hear that the hon. Member has succeeded in bringing to the Table a perfectly orderly Question.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I can only say that in my own judgment it was orderly. But I hope Mr. Speaker will make inquiry, because the blue pencil is exercised most delightfully on my Questions.

The Public in the Central Hall,

MR. PIERPOINT (Warrington): I beg to ask Mr. Speaker whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that an apparently organised crowd was gathered in the Central Hall on Monday evening, and that so as to preserve order the police moved part of the crowd into Old Palace-yard, and whether there is any rule or order of the House which limits the number of strangers to be allowed within the precincts of the House when it is sitting.

*MR. SPEAKER: The only regulation of the House I am aware of is that contained in one of the Sessional Orders, which directs the Commissioners of the Police and the Sergeant-at-Arms to see that there is no disorder and no annoyance within the precincts of the House. As to what took place on Monday, I knew nothing at the time of there being any great crowd, but I was afterwards informed that there had been a considerable crowd in the central lobby. I made some inquiry and learned from the Sergeant-at-Arms and from the inspector of police that although there was a considerable crowd, and some noise, the passages were kept open and that there was nothing in the circumstances which appeared to make it necessary to report to me that there was disorder or annoyance or to take any steps. The only step that was taken, I understand, was that when the inspector of police found that the number of people in the central lobby was becoming very large, the police at the western entrance to St. Stephen's Hall were instructed not to allow more to come in until there was room, and those who were there were directed to retire, and they did retire.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Do we understand that hon. Members on the other side are afraid of meeting their constituents?

[No Answer was returned.]

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS.

The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means.

ALIENS BILL.

Reported, so far as amended, in the Standing Committee on Law, etc.

Leave given to the Standing Committee to make a Special Report.

Special Report brought up, and read.

Report and Special Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 242.]

Minutes of Proceedings to be printed. [No. 242.]

PRIVATE LEGISLATION PROCEDURE (WALES) BILL.

Reported, without Amendment, from the Select Committee, with Special Report and Minutes of Evidence.

Special Report brought up, and read.

Report and Special Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 243.]

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Mr. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection that they had discharged the following Members from the Standing Committee on Law, and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure:—Mr. Attorney-General, Major Seeley, Mr. Dalziel, Mr. Peel, Mr. Claude Hay, Mr. Moon, Sir Harry Samuel, Mr. James Bailey, Mr. Seymour Ormsby-Gore, Mr. Theodore Taylor, Mr. Thomas Shaw, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. John Rutherford, Mr. Joyce, Mr. Hugh Law, Dr. Shipman, and Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree; and appointed in substitution: Mr. Solicitor-General, Mr. Shackleton, Mr. Colston, Mr. Lloyd Morgan, Mr. Dillon, Mr. Swift MacNeill, Mr. Jacoby, Mr. Matthew White Ridley, Lieutenant-Colonel Pryce-Jones, Mr. Henry Hobhouse, Mr. George Faber, Mr. Helder, Sir George Fardell, Sir George Bartley, Mr. Haldane, Mr. Samuel Evans, and Mr. Soares.

Report to lie upon the Table.

NEW BILL.

UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL BILL.

"To extend the privileges of the Graduates of the University of Liverpool," presented by Sir John Brunner; supported by Mr. Haldane, Mr. W. F. Lawrence, Mr. Stock, Sir John Willox, Mr. Charles McArthur, Mr. David MacIver, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Houston, and Mr. Watson Rutherford; to be read a second time upon Thursday next, and to be printed. [Bill 259.]

SUPPLY [16TH ALLOTTED DAY.]

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1904-5.

CLASS III.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £71,342, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of the Irish Land Commission."

*MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.) moved to reduce the Vote by £1,000 in order to call attention to the working of the Land Act of last year. During the passage of the Act, he said, they were told that they were going to have a new Ireland, that industries were to be revived, and that, in fact, immigration was to be substituted for emigration. But, instead, they had a feeling of dissatisfaction and discontent owing to the way in which the Act was working. They were promised a great electrical boom in the establishment of the Iveagh-Pirrie Motor Scheme, but before the end of the year they learned that the scheme had been, if he might say so, actually dead before it was born, and, instead of a spirit of confidence having been created throughout the country, dissatisfaction and discontent were rampant owing to the way in which the Land Act was being worked. It could not be denied that hon. Members representing the tenant farmers acted in a straightforward and conciliatory manner, being ready to meet the landlord party more than halfway. They were prepared to put up with great defects in the Bill in order to give every possible chance for the realisation of the prophecy of the supporters of the Bill, and in order to give every opportunity of testing the sincerity of the landlords and their friends. It must be admitted that their National organisation in Ireland had not up to the present taken any precipitate action whatever, notwithstanding that the landlords had completely spurned the conciliatory policy; on the contrary, the farmers had shown the greatest possible forbearance. What was the result? The landlords, instead of accepting the bonus in the spirit in which it was intended, viz., in order to bridge over the difference between them and the tenants, had increased their demands, exclusive of the bonus, by six, eight, and ten years purchase. In some cases they had demanded almost double the former value of their properties. He knew of one case in which the landlord, prior to the passing of the Act, was willing to sell to his tenants at nineteen years purchase, whereas he was now demanding twenty-six-and-a-half years, which, with the bonus, represented thirty years purchase.

The Land Commissioners were giving dissatisfaction equally to landlords and tenants. They had no regular system; they lacked cohesion and they were incapable. He knew of one who was actually unable to distinguish between a wheat and an oats crop in the end of July and was appointed Land Commissioner the following November. He believed he was appointed a Commissioner solely because he was a captain of Militia. Any Land Commissioner who happened to be a practical man was hunted about from pillar to post. In his opinion, the money at present devoted to the carrying on of the work of the Land Commissioners was really wasted; and he pointed to the remarkable fact that there was scarcely any difference in the rents, whether fixed in the Land Commissioners' Court, the County Court, or through the aid of valuers. It could really, he declared, only be described as the penny-in-the-slot system. It was quite a waste of time and money for landlords and tenants to go into these Courts; the thing had become a regular farce, for, whatever evidence was given and whatever inspections followed, it did not alter the thing one iota. The decisions were all arranged beforehand. Incidentally he spoke of Land Commissioners' driving round on their visits of inspection with land agents; and, turning to statistics, he showed that in return for the £180,000 paid to the Land Commission for the years 1902 and 1903 they had only a few estates sold and a gross reduction of rents of £49,637. This, he declared, was an extraordinary state of things, requiring most serious consideration.

With regard to the Land Purchase Act of last year, he thought the first question that would occur to the Irish Members would be what answer the Chief Secretary could give to the complete indifference and neglect shown to the evicted tenants in Ireland. Last year the most positive assurances were given by the Chief Secretary that the question of the evicted tenants would be attended to, and that it was the desire of the Government that the evicted tenants question should be satisfactorily and speedily settled. What had happened since? In the Return furnished they found that up to 30th April forty-one evicted tenants had been reinstated by their landlords and twenty-four only had been reinstated by the Estates Commissioners, whilst the enormous sum of £2,252 had been handed over by way of grants. The Chief Secretary had said that owing to the uncertainty of the bonus with regard to the sale of untenanted land there had been delay, but, if that were so, why did he not get his amending Bill passed? He wished to draw attention to the Land Judge's Court in Ireland. The tenants on the Westropp Estate in the county of Clare approached the Estates Commissioners with a request that they should buy up the estate. The matter was brought by the receiver's solicitor before the Land Judge's Court, and when it was explained to the Land Judge that the tenants were in negotiation with the Estates Commissioners, he declared that he would not allow this thing to go on, and that the tenants were mistaken if they thought they could go behind his back; and to punish them he put back their cases for a period of twelve months. He wished to know what the Chief Secretary and the Attorney-General had to say in defence of this attitude of the Land Judge. He desired also to know what was the explanation of the increased prices of land to-day in the Land Judge's Court. How was it they had orders sent out that tenants must pay twenty-four and twenty-four-and-a-half years purchase when the average for the preceding year was much lower? He wanted to know what the Estates Commissioners would do in cases where the landlords had offered to sell at reasonable prices of seventeen, eighteen, and nineteen years purchase before the passing of the Act, and had now increased their price to twenty-four-and-a-half years purchase. This was a question of very great importance. What would the Estates Commissioners do in the case where a landlord was willing three or four years ago to sell to the tenants at twenty-two-and-a-half years purchase, and was only prevented doing so, because the Commissioners refused to sanction the advance. Now that landlord was demanding twenty-four-and-a-half years, and again he asked what the Estates Commissioners would do in that case?

When a landlord in the West of Ireland desired to effect a sale, instead of allowing the tenant to go into Court for the second-term rent, he held out the bribe of an abatement of 5 or 10 per cent., in order to get the tenant to sign second-term judicial agreements, notwithstanding that the reduction must be seventeen, eighteen, or twenty per cent., and he would claim that he was within the zone of twenty-four-and-a-half years purchase, besides tacking on a year or two of the arrears. The complaint they had to make was that up to the present they saw the prices of land going up, and, as was prophesied by the hon. Member for East Mayo at the time of the passage of the Bill, all the coercion, intimidation, and obstruction was on the side of the landlords. What steps were the Estates Commissioners taking to safeguard the interests of the tenants? He thought they were perfectly justified in raising this matter. There was no doubt that the zone system was being abused and it was being abused for the deliberate purpose of raising the price of land. The surprise to him was that under the circumstances the people of Ireland had shown so much patience. He felt convinced that the Chief Secretary was anxious that this Bill should work satisfactorily, and that the measure which he initiated should do something in the direction of settling the great agrarian trouble in Ireland. That was an ambition which any man would be proud to attain, but in his opinion the Chief Secretary was going the wrong way about it. All Chief Secretaries who entered the Dublin Castle ring came out of it discredited, and the right hon. Gentleman appeared to be giving too much latitude to the Dublin Castle party. If the Chief Secretary insisted upon Irish tenants paying unreasonable and exorbitant prices it would be the ruin of them and their families; he ought to put his foot down, and let the landlords see that they could not get this bonus tacked on to their exorbitant prices. If they wished the Land Act to bring the blessings to Ireland which had been anticipated, they would have to adopt another method and have the Act administered in a more reasonable and fair spirit. The purchasers ought to have some protection from the exorbitant and unreasonable demands made by the Irish landlords. He begged to move a reduction of this Vote by £1,000.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum not exceeding £70,342, be granted for the said Service." — (*Mr. Cullinan.*)

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.) said the first comment he wished to make was the inconvenience the House was put to in having to discuss this Vote without the Report. The financial year of the Commission ended on the 31st of March, and if they desired any information for the purposes of this debate they had no means of getting it, and they were driven back upon the old Report of last year. That was a preposterous state of things and it was not fair to the House of Commons. It was not fair to any hon. Member who took an interest in the Irish land question to be compelled to go back to the year 1903 when he desired the figures for 1904. He was sure that the Chief Secretary would not deny that it was an extraordinary thing that they should be utterly bereft of the facts and figures of last year. The Chief Secretary ought to have insisted upon having the Report of that Commission before this Vote was discussed. It was not an extraordinary demand to make, and he pressed it now upon the Chief Secretary. It was quite natural that the interest in the land question should be turned from fair rents to purchase of late. He did not wonder at that, but it would be a mistake if Irish Members, in their anxiety to promote land purchase, should forget what was going on in the fair-rent Courts. There was one aspect of the question to which he desired to draw the attention of the Chief Secretary—he should like him to tell the House the number of fair-rent cases which had been heard and disposed of during the past year. At present they had no means of knowing, and he should like the right hon. Gentleman to give them the average number of reductions of first-term and second-term rents, and also the number of Commissioners actually engaged in fair-rent work. He understood that a very large number of Commissioners and Sub-commissioners had been removed from fair-rent work and placed upon work connected with the Estates Commission. When they knew the number of cases which had been settled they would be able to see whether they had got value for their money.

He wished to call the Chief Secretary's attention to the question of appeals, in regard to which he thought the Irish Party had a considerable grievance. On the 31st of March, 1902, there were 12,680 appeals outstanding, and on the 31st of March, 1903, there were 13,082. He did not know how many were outstanding the year before that. When he pointed out that many of these appeals had been pending for five or six years the Committee would at once see the hardship involved. In the case of county Monaghan the Appeal Court had not sat for eighteen months, and in that county there were more than 1,000 appeals outstanding. The system worked badly in more respects than one. In the first place these farmers who had had their rents unfixed for five or six years did not know what their actual rents were. That was not a fair position to put them in, and their rents ought to be fixed in a reasonable time. It was all important that the farmer should know what his rent was, in case the landlord proposed to sell, and he had no means of knowing that if his case was outstanding on appeal. The result was, in more cases than one, that he was wheedled into consenting to take the rent as it stood at present, or as it stood before, and he thus was induced to purchase on unfair terms. In addition to that it was not reasonable or fair that a farmer conducting his business should not know what his rent was. This delay worked badly for purchase and badly for the thrift of the farmer. It was absolute nonsense to say that an appeal on the question of fair rent should be pending five or six years. The Chief Secretary had tried his hand at improving matters and endeavouring to remedy the difficulty—he was not blaming him, but the system. He did not know the result of the new system of appeal. That was not fair. Why should a Member of Parliament be without this information? They were all interested in knowing how the new system worked. They had taken away one of the Appeal Judges from his work, and it was perfectly impossible that he should give the time to it he had done. He could not be in Dublin settling nice points of law that were arising every day in the Estates Commissioners' Department, and also in the country fixing fair rents. This was part of the new system. Then Mr. Commissioner Fitzgerald, who called himself a Judge, but was no more a Judge than he himself, was also an Appeal Judge. He should be glad to hear the result of Mr. Commissioner Fitzgerald's work, but the Committee would find that comparatively little had been done in the way of getting rid of the arrears of appeals.

He should like to make a suggestion to the Chief Secretary, though he doubted very much whether he would accept it. He would like to know what were the proceedings going on under the old Land Act of 1896. There were, let the Committee remember, two Land Commissioners derelict at the present moment. They had nothing to do; though Mr. Lynch drew something like £3,000, and Mr. Murrough O'Brien £2,500. Would the Chief Secretary tell him what was being done under the old Purchase Act of 1896, which these two gentlemen administered? If they could learn the number of estates sold under the old Act they would see what value they were getting for the £2,500 and the £3,000 paid to these gentlemen respectively. Why should not Mr. Murrough O'Brien and Mr. Stanislaus Lynch be sent out as Appeal Judges.

It would be an interesting experiment. If they were sent out together it was certain that fair rents would stand. Mr. Lynch would have one thought and Mr. O'Brien another; and the result would be the rent would stand, because they would never reach a conclusion. He thought substantial justice would be done in that case. At all events, let them know what value they got for the £5,500 out of the Irish Treasury—it was nonsense to talk about the English Treasury; it was the Irish Treasury—and if the Chief Secretary would not send them to appeal work let him find them some work they could do without doing mischief. It would not be easy, but let him try. He hoped the Chief Secretary would say what was the state of appeal business now. One strange thing he had been told was that the bulk of the appeals were not in counties like Antrim and Down, where there was excellent hotel accommodation. Living was rather pleasant there. The real difficulty was in counties like Monaghan [A NATIONALIST MEMBER: Fermanagh] — No they were better in Fermanagh. The bulk of the appeal work was in the outlying counties, where the appeal gentleman did not like to go and lodge, and where living was not so pleasant of an evening. This business of appeal had really become so serious that the Chief Secretary ought to try and do something to settle it. The present machinery was not sufficient. He ought to devise other machinery.

The next matter he came to was the Estates Commissioners. He had no fault to find with these gentlemen, or their work, but he wanted information. That was what they were entitled to, though they did not get much of it. For example, he wanted to know something about the staff, and in order that that information should be useful they must know something about the work. Up to 30th April they had a Return. They knew what had been done up to 30th April. He wanted to know how the figures stood now. In the first place, how many estates had been actually sold by the Estates Commissioners, and had the money been paid and the transactions closed? Then he should like to know what was the position of the work at the present moment—that was to say, in regard to how many estates were there applications, and what was the amount in money actually pending before the Estates Commissioners now? He should greatly like to know what the staff was—how many inspectors they had, because if the inspecting staff was not sufficient there would be interminable delay, to the great detriment both of the selling landlord and the purchasing tenant. He saw a representative of the Treasury present. He should like to say frankly that the Treasury was never too active in advancing aid for purposes like this in Ireland. He was not quite sure that the representatives of the Treasury at this moment were very anxious about the work at all, but he should like to say to the Chief Secretary that this was a matter which would not brook delay. If these applications were coming in at the rate currently reported, if there was a block at the present moment, as was currently reported, then it devolved upon him to see that the staff was sufficient to deal with that block and to have it removed. He knew that money was scarce. At all events, the representatives of Ireland had a right to insist on this. The Exchequer got £10,000,000 a year from Irish taxation, and the Government ran the country for £7,000,000. There was thus an Imperial contribution of £3,000,000. At all events, on the land question the Treasury could not only afford to spend money, but they ought to spend it. The House ought not to allow any excuse for this work being delayed in any shape or form, and as regarded clerks and inspectors, his opinion was that it was being delayed for lack of both.

Let him put another Qustion to the Chief Secretary in regard to purchase work. The Act provided for the purchase of estates by the Commissioners. He saw from the Dublin newspapers that some friction was already beginning between the Land Judge's Court and the Estates Commissioners. He saw that the Judge of the Land Judge's Court was developing a lofty idea of what his responsibilities and obligations were. Obligations to whom? He desired to know from the Chief Secretary to-night how many estates in the Land Judge's Court had been purchased by the Estates Commissioners. He did not believe there had been one where the purchase had been completed. He did know estates that were in progress. There was one in which he was personally interested. He supposed it would be finished some time next century. It had been in Court since 1882. It went in a perfectly solvent estate. It was now bankrupt, and nobody had made a penny out of it except the lawyers. There were negotiations pending between the Estates Commissioners and the Land Judge, and he wanted to know what length these negotiations had actually gone. How much money had been paid on that head? He wanted also some figures with reference to the Congested Districts Board. It would be interesting if the Chief Secretary could give a list of purchases so far as the Congested Districts Board was concerned. There was a section in the Act which authorised the Land Commission to negotiate directly with the landlords for the sale of their estates. He wanted to know how much negotiation had taken place under that head. How many landlords had called in the Estates Commissioners to fix the value of their land with the view to sales? All these figures would be intensely interesting if the Chief Secretary could oblige the Committee with them. He would be glad, for his own information, and for the information of the people of Ireland, if the Chief Secretary would give an account of what was going on in all these several Departments, and especially in regard to the working of appeals, for he could assure the right hon. Gentleman that the farmers were exceedingly anxious on that point.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover) said he took the somewhat unusual course of rising early in the afternoon, not to make a set speech and not to preclude his right to speak again, but to answer a number of Questions which had been addressed to him by the hon. Members who had preceded him. He freely admitted that information in regard to a number of the matters referred to had only been brought down to the end of April in the Returns, and he agreed that it would be for the convenience of speakers who were to follow that he should give such further information as he could put at their disposal. Therefore, the principal part of what he would say would be in answer to definite Questions addressed to him. He might say at once that he welcomed from the hon. Member who spoke first his concluding remarks, namely, that he was convinced that he (the Chief Secretary) wished this Act to work well. That was so, and in his answer he trusted that he might be able to give some reason for believing that the Act was not working badly. But there must be grounds for disappointment. Within a year of the passing of such a measure he did not disguise that the question of staff was a very pertinent one. They could not have the old rent-fixing staff going on on its old establishment, and at the same moment improvise a new purchase staff adequate for work which was increasing from day to day and from month to month. Many points in connection with the problems arising out of the Act required a great deal of careful consideration on their administrative side. They often required a legal decision on some abtruse question of law, but on these grounds they had not lost hope, if after some nine months the progress made under this Act had not been so great as had been expected. He wished to answer some of the Questions addressed to him, and he would make a full and frank confession at the very start. His own attention, in common with the attention of most people interested in the Irish land question, had been concentrated in recent months rather upon the purchase side than the rent-fixing side of the question, and he was not prepared, as in an ordinary year he might have been, to give very full information on the number of rent-fixing cases that had been decided. He noticed the complaint of the hon. Member for South Tyrone that they had not the Report of the Land Commission. That complaint had often been made, but he would ask hon. Members to realise that this was a very voluminous and complex Report and that it had to furnish very varied and very minute information upon numbers of matters carried down to the 31st March. To collect the statistical material for that Report was, with good fortune, an operation of two months duration and sometimes more. Then it had to be digested and tabulated, and in the past it had never proved possible, as a matter of fact, to produce that Report before August. He had been urging the Land Commission on the subject and they were making their best endeavours to get the Report out at an earlier date, but it had not been possible to produce it before the 13th July. In response to very natural curiosity they had compiled reports dealing with statistics of the Land Purchase Acts brought down to the end of March of last year, and he had supplied other information. He agreed that it would be desirable that they should have the Report as soon as possible.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL asked whether the Report itself, which was only a few pages, and summarised the whole of the proceedings of the Department, could not have been issued at an earlier time.

Mr. WYNDHAM said that he might perhaps consider that for another occasion. Turning to the question of appeals he said he was glad to do so, because at the first blush the figures were on the face of them very discouraging; and it was only when they examined and analysed them, and when they considered that the provisions affecting appeals in the Act of last year had only recently come into operation, and when they made other discounts, that they were able to arrive at the conclusion which he urged, namely, that the provisions affecting appeals introduced into last year's Act were likely to work well. The hon. Member for South Tyrone had said that it was a very serious matter for Irish tenant occupiers at the present moment that their appeals should not be decided. The fact that they were not decided might lead them into making a worse bargain than they might otherwise conclude with their landlords. He did not think that contention was a very good one—[An Hon. Member: It is.] He would give his reasons. He was disposed rather to agree with the hon. Member for South Tipperary. He did not quite agree with the reasons the hon. Member gave; but he accepted his conclusion, which was that there was an enormous waste of time and money in respect of all this fair-rent litigation. He thought that was so; and, in particular, in respect of appeals the waste of time and money was altogether out of proportion to the results obtained from these appeals. Who was it who initiated these appeals?

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL: Both sides.

Mr. WYNDHAM said these appeals were initiated by the landlord in 80 per cent. of the cases. It was perfectly true that if they took a number of appeals they would find something more of an equality, but that was because the tenant entered a cross-appeal. Unless he did so the only possible result was that his rent would be raised. This had involved a great amount of waste of time and money, which was deplorable, and for the sake of 2s. 6d. or 5s. variation he doubted whether any tenant was well advised in waiting eighteen months or two years to have his appeal heard, if he could enter into a bargain for purchase which he thought reasonable and proper. At any rate, the reasons which urged him last year to invite the House to deal with the question of appeals were, that he felt that they constituted an abuse and placed an enormous and unnecessary tax on the agricultural community in Ireland. If he took the year to 30th June, 1903, the number of outstanding appeals was 13,252; and if he took the year to 30th June last there was not a diminution but an increase, the number being 13,700, an increase of 448. They must look at that matter a little bit more closely. Of course the provisions of the Act of last year could scarcely have been expected to operate effectively during the whole of the period which had elapsed since then; and if they turned, not so much to the numbers outstanding as to the numbers which had been lodged, they would find that the figures were of a more promising description. In the year to 30th June, 1903, 4,979 were lodged; in the year to 30th June last, 4,422. But let them take the six months to June last year and to June this year. In respect of the first period the number lodged was 2,816, and to the second 1,790, and let them take the three months up to these two dates, and they would find that last year the number lodged was 1,280 and this year 789.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: Of course I knew nothing about these figures.

MR. WYNDHAM said he was only giving the information asked for. With these figures before them there was a great deal of ground for saying that there was continuous progress, and that the provisions put into the Act of last year which were intended to discourage unnecessary litigation were having that effect. He had no doubt that it would be possible to operate upon that continuous diminution, and that they would, he hoped in no very long time, diminish the number of these outstanding appeals. But he frankly confessed to the Committee that it was not possible to start at a high establishment the work of furthering appeals, the work for fixing fair rents in the first instance, and the work for purchase. He did not think that could be done. He made no complaint, he need scarcely say, of the treatment which he had received at the hands of the Treasury during the year. But money had been very scarce. He thought it reasonable, in view of certain prophecies put forward soon after they passed the Act of last year to the effect that there was much cry and little wool, and that there would be no transactions, to show that the Act was working before claiming that a large staff of salaried officials, who were permanent civil servants and entitled to pensions, should be created. Supposing these ill-omened prophecies had proved true, they might have saddled the Estimates with £20,000 or £30,000 a year paid to gentlemen who would be doing very little. The original indoor staff on the purchase side embraced thirty-one persons with salaries amounting to £10,760 a year. Since then there had been added two assistant examiners, one first-class clerk, two second-class clerks, twelve second-division clerks, a managing clerk and twenty-two abstractors, while the amount of salaries had been increased to £13,770. The outdoor staff was also very important. At the beginning, before the estates came in, he was not in a position to claim that there should be a great number of inspectors sitting in Dublin when there was no call for their services to the country districts of Ireland. Originally in November arrangements were made for eleven inspectors, whose salaries amounted to £8,800 a year and two surveyors with salaries amounting to £240 a year, but he arranged in March last for six more inspectors and five temporary inspectors, temporary in the sense that their places would be taken in October by inspectors from the rent-fixing department, also for four assistant inspectors, and ten surveyors, so that at the present moment the salaries of officials engaged solely in purchase work amounted to £34,300 a year. He did not think that could be called a niggardly provision. Of course the staff would not have been increased unless he had been able to show that the work of land purchase was also increasing.

Again, at the outset, he frankly confessed that he had been personally disappointed at the little progress which they had succeeded in making in respect to two of the most important objects of the Act, namely, congestion and the reinstatement of evicted tenants. That was to him a matter of personal disappointment. He had been accused that afternoon of not having displayed sufficient energy in finding time for the stages of the amending Land Bill, but he would ask hon. Members, in whatever quarter of the House they sat, to cast their minds back over the last few weeks and months, and to say whether the opportunities for legislation had been very large; because he did not think in all his experience, with the possible exception of the year 1893, he recollected a year in which the obstacles to legislation had been so many and so large. It was his earnest desire to pass the Bill, and it was put down for Friday. It was clear that unless the bonus were attached to untenanted land it was all but impossible to make any practical advance in dealing with that question. There had been occasions when arrangements could be made upon this or that property, but unless the Estates Commissioners could have some land in their hands, so to speak, to play with they would not be able to deal with the question satisfactorily. His instructions to the Estates Commissioners had been that they should make a point of endeavouring to deal with the question of evicted tenants.

Mr. ROCHE (Galway, E.) asked whether they were to understand that untenanted land did not carry a bonus at present.

Mr. WYNDHAM said that it was a matter of some doubt after certain judicial observations. If a bonus were needed for tenanted land, it was needed still more for untenanted land, because the value of untenanted land was often greater than tenanted land. They did not, of course, wish that the tenants to whom they were going to sell untenanted land should pay higher annual instalments than those who were actually occupying land. They proposed to reinstate men who had not been farming for some years, and who were not overburdened with capital. It was idle to suppose that they would have a chance, or that the money of the taxpayer would be secured, unless they got such land upon such terms which would enable them to have some hope of success. The bonus was absolutely essential in the case of untenanted land. The Congested Districts Board had been able to buy a certain amount of untenanted land; but that had only been possible by his taking a great deal of responsibility upon himself, and promising that if Parliament did not pass the Bill he would take the money out of the Congested Districts Board's funds. The Estates Commissioners were not able to buy untenanted land in that way, because they had no funds. They were, of course, buying as cheaply as they could; but they did not think it wise to endeavour to force people, who came forward in good faith, to sell untenanted land which was a very valuable asset in Ireland. There seemed to be an idea in some quarters that extraordinary pressure was going to be used in order to force landlords to sell untenanted land. It was not desired to buy in any land at less than the market value, and they could well afford to purchase it at a fair price. The object he hoped to achieve by getting untenanted land was an object for which money could be well devoted. The Estates Commissioners had been able to deal with evicted tenants. To the knowledge of the Commissioners fifty tenants had been put back by the landlords, and many more might have been. Twenty-four had been reinstated by the Estates Commissioners, and they were in treaty to restore twenty more. The amount of untenanted land purchased had been 3,293 acres.

Undue importance, he thought, had been attached to the number of transactions which had been actually concluded. It was obvious that when the Act had only been in operation for nine months a number of transactions, which were sure to be concluded in the course of a few weeks or months, were not concluded at present. It took a certain number of months to finish these complicated operations. If they simply took the number of holdings and the amount of money involved, they would form an entirely erroneous idea of the amount of success which had attended the operations. To argue on the amount of money which had been advanced up to the present would be most irrational. With reference to the amount of business transacted between the Estates Commissioners and the Land Judge, advances had been applied for in respect of twenty-eight estates embracing 987 holdings and involving £301,680. In addition, requests had been issued in respect to nineteen other estates. He agreed it was pertinent to ask whether any transactions had been finished. As a matter of fact, advances had been sanctioned in respect of nine estates embracing 194 holdings and involving £67,000 odd. Under Section 6, advances had been applied for in respect of twenty-six estates embracing 2,403 holdings, involving advances of £678,458. In addition to those, other proceedings were pending in respect of eleven other estates. The hon. Member for Waterford seemed to be disappointed that the number was not larger. It was not a very large one, but at the outset of all the discussions on land purchase, all parties concerned—landlords, tenants, hon. Members representing Irish constituencies on the opposite side of the House, and hon. Members also representing Ireland on the Unionist side of the House—were at one in impressing upon him the great desirability of not making much use of that section, but of proceeding upon the section dealing with direct sales. There had been some changes in certain directions, but hon. Members, he believed, were right in their original idea in the main. If purchase was to proceed in Ireland, it was better that the bargain should be arrived at by the persons who knew most about it. It was not wise to throw the weight of administrative influence into the scale and to appoint enormous staffs; and the employment of experts to decide value should only be resorted to when every other method had failed. Other methods showed no signs of failing. Taking the direct sales—the figures came up to 2nd July—advances had been applied for in respect of 682 estates, embracing 14,476 holdings, and involving £6,630,502, or in the three categories together 736 estates, embracing £17,866 holdings, involving £7,610,650. He did not say that represented an overwhelming success; there were many points of difficulty still to be met; but he had no doubt progress would be easier in the future, and he did not think they should lose heart when so many agreements had been arrived at voluntarily and really without friction. As a rule, the cases which they heard about in the newspapers were not those which had been successful, but those in which there had been difficulties. He would now turn to the Congested Districts Board, with reference to which he had recently given information. The number of estates actually purchased by the Board was twenty-five, embracing 1,655 holdings; but that did not give indication of the amount of purchase made. The amount of tenanted land purchased was 37,075 acres, and untenanted 28,970 acres, the purchase money involving £370,000. Negotiations were pending in respect of twenty-six other estates, embracing 24,000 acres of tenanted, and 18,000 acres of untenanted land. He rose not to make a speech, but to answer a Question and so to give information.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.) said the right hon. Gentleman could not and did not complain that they were bringing up these matters for discussion. He was afraid the experience which they had gained during the nine months from the working of the Land Act in the congested districts had been entirely unsatisfactory, and they felt, in spite of all they had done to make the Act work satisfactorily, and harmoniously, that they were being driven back to the Act of 1881, in order to have fair rents fixed. It might be doubted whether the Act of last year left the poorest parts of the country generally in a worse condition than before it was passed, but that was exactly the position in which his part of the country (Kerry) was at the present moment. During the nine months that had passed, the Congested Districts Board had purchased one holding in Kerry, of an area of 226 acres and had paid £300. That was the holding of an evicted tenant. The Estates Commissioners had purchased only four estates in the county at a cost of less than £220. It could not be said that the tenants had been unreasonable in the prices which they had offered to the landlord; but on the other hand they were quite satisfied that the landlords had been most unreasonable in the prices they had demanded from the tenants. The delay in hearing originating notices was as great as that in hearing appeals. At the beginning of the present month he understood there were 13,700 appeals unheard. As the highest number of appeals dealt with in any one year was only 3,000, it would take nearly five years to clear the list, even assuming no fresh cases were entered. Such a condition of affairs was simply intolerable. The position with regard to originating notices was equally bad. In Kerry alone, according to the last Return, there were 1,000 appeals unheard, while the number of originating notices unheard was simply alarming. A solicitor had written him enclosing a list of fifty cases of his own, in which notices of appeal were served in 1901–2, and stating that hardly anything was being done in the way of fixing rents. That was extremely unsatisfactory, and was bound to influence tenants against accepting terms of purchase. He was informed in the same letter that at the sessions just over, a great number of landlords sued for the hanging gale, a thing that had never been done before. That was the way in which landlords were co-operating to give effect to the conciliatory policy adopted last year! Their object was doubtless to drive the poor people to purchase on exorbitant terms. The Land Act of 1903 had not proved the success that had been hoped for, and the least the Government could do was to see that the Act of 1881 was given a fair opportunity of working. Another matter of complaint was the lack of progress made in the restoration of evicted tenants. He had brought a case to the notice of the Chief Secretary, in which practically the whole of an estate had been sold, with the exception of one farm, which was in the occupation of a man with no judicial lease or legal right. Under the Act of last year the Estates Commissioners had power to treat with that man, and, if they could induce him to leave, to reinstate the evicted tenant. The point he desired to put was—what would the Estates Commissioners do in that case? The matter was of considerable importance, because there were many other cases of a similar character. He also suggested, in regard to a farm in Tralee, about which he had communicated with the Congested Districts Board, that pending the decision of the Board, some one should be sent down to inspect and value the farm.

Mr. POWER (Waterford, E.) referring to the figures quoted by the Chief Secretary, reminded the right hon. Gentleman that about six weeks ago the hon. and learned Member for Waterford suggested that the Report of the Commissioners, or a summary of their proceedings, should be supplied to hon. Members. The circumstances were so complicated, and the figures so numerous, that the Committee would have been in a much better position to discuss the subject if that suggestion had been carried out. It was satisfactory to hear that the staff of the Estates Commissioners had been increased. That body had to discharge an important duty, which the people were hopeful would lead to beneficial results. In view of the enlargement of the staff, he thought that when evicted tenants sent in applications for reinstatement their letters should at least be acknowledged. The mere writing of a letter was often a severe task to the class of man concerned, and it was not much to ask that its receipt should be acknowledged. With regard to the main subject of discussion, the success or otherwise of land purchase wholly depended upon the prices tenants were asked to give. When the Bill was introduced last year, the Chief Secretary was able to prove that there were practically no arrears in the payment of instalments in Ireland. The landlords had been bringing pressure to bear upon the tenants in cases where there had been default, and it could not be said that a man who was largely in arrear was a free agent. He knew cases where considerable arrears were due, and those tenants were poor and were likely to remain poor. The Chief Secretary must recognise that, broadly speaking, the spirit of conciliation shown by the Irish tenantry had not been reciprocated by the landlords, and pressure had been brought to bear upon the tenants in regard to prices. The hon. Member for West Kerry had alluded to some cases which occurred in his constituency. He wished to refer to the case of a large property which had passed into the hands of Lord Ashton. Within the last few days seven of the most respectable tenants on the estate—one of whom was the chairman of the County Council of Waterford—waited upon his lordship and tried to come to terms for the purchase of their holdings, and they asked for a certain remission with regard to the current half-year's rent. A few days afterwards these seven tenants were singled out and proceedings were taken against them, the idea being to extort higher prices from them. He could not state exactly what the offer of the tenants was, but it was a fair offer, and one which two years ago no landlord in the South of Ireland ever thought he would get. He mentioned that as an instance of the sort of pressure which was being brought to bear upon the tenants. It was to the interests of all parties that the Land Act should work well, but if the people were to live and thrive on the farms it was necessary that free sale should exist and no pressure of this kind should be brought to bear.

Mr. MURPHY (Kerry, E.) said he wished to assocate himself with the demand which the hon. Member for West Kerry had made in reference to the cases of appeals in the county of Kerry. The explanation which the right hon. Gentleman had made was quite unsatisfactory, for the whole procedure of the Irish Land Commission had been attended by unwarrantable delay. He knew that every tenant who sought relief had to pay some costs and undergo very great hardship and inconvenience. If the tenants were to have any safeguard at all, and any remedy against landlords who would not sell, the right hon. Gentleman ought to open the door to them and offer them some protection. In the county of Kerry nothing had been done for the evicted tenants, who were men determined to get back their old holdings. The Estates Commissioners would have no difficulty in reinstating them because, owing to combination and strength of public opinion, very few of these holdings had been "grabbed." He had had a great deal of experience of evicted tenants in the county of Kerry, and, notwithstanding the opportunities given to the Commissioners to effect a settlement, nothing had been done. The Estates Commissioners had done nothing although he had made constant representations to them, and although all they needed to do would be to negotiate in order to effect a reinstatement. When a landlord was about to sell his estate, and of his own motion restore the evicted tenants to their old farms, were the Estates Commissioners going to give them any assistance towards rebuilding and restocking? Supposing a landlord did not sell and the farm was vacant although a fair rent had been fixed, were the Estates Commissioners going to do nothing until the landlord sold his entire estate? He felt very strongly upon this question of the evicted tenants in the county of Kerry and the South of Ireland. Some of the actions of the Estates Commissioners were not deserving of the complimentary references made about them, and they expected them to hold the balance more evenly between landlord and tenant. The hon. Member for South Kerry asked a Question dealing with the purchase of an estate in the southern portion of the county of Kerry, and the right hon. Gentleman replied that the terms of purchase would be open to inspection by the Estates Commissioners before they sanctioned the sale. He believed that those prices were within the zone and consequently there would be no inspection. Moreover, the estate was clearly congested and was practically an agricultural slum of the worst description. If this kind of thing was allowed to go on it would have an injurious effect.

The Congested Districts Board made a great deal of enlarging farms and restoring people to the land, and finding them more suitable employment. It had been said that 226 acres in Kerry were purchased by the Board for £300, and when the hon. Member for Galway heard this statement he turned round in accents of surprise and asked. "Do you mean £300?" There were two farms in the county of Kerry formerly held by two evicted tenants. In one case the tenant paid £2,000 for his holding a very few years before he was evicted; and in the other case the tenant had been in occupation all his life and was evicted for the non-payment of a single year's rent. The farm for which £2,000 was paid was to be sold by public auction, and it would probably realise something like £1,800, and the other would fetch about £500. But, notwithstanding that what he had stated was the true value of the farms, the Congested Districts Board in an underhand manner negotiated with the landlord and took the farms from him. He wished to know if those tenants were going to be kept out by such an improper proceeding as that. So improper was this proceeding that when he made representations to the Board as to the iniquity of this transaction the Chief Secretary made an offer of the sum of £300, and another tenant offered the sum of £150 There must have been something wrong in the initial proceedings when the Board had made the offer which he had described. [A NATIONALIST MEMBER: Hush money!] It was not going to have any effect in hushing the tenants or their spokesmen. A further offer in reference to these farms had been made to the Congested Districts Board in the most straightforward manner. It represented the opinion of the parish priest, the chairman of the rural district council, the chairman of the county council, and all the representative public men of the locality, including himself, who had signed a petition representing the circumstances to the Board. If the right hon. Gentleman wanted to preserve proper conditions with reference to the land question in county Kerry, it would be much more politic and fair if he were to adopt the suggestion of the hon. Member for West Kerry, and deal with farms sold under fair conditions rather than with those from which unfortunate people had been evicted. One of the evicted tenants had spent the years which had intervened in Killarney Workhouse. In connection with this dispute he had received from Dr. O'Donnell and Father O'Hara the greatest possible sympathy, and although he had not been able to get them to agree to his views in reference to the position of affairs, he ascribed that to the fact that they were remote from Kerry. The Chief Secretary had listened with the greatest possible attention and patience to what he had to say, and while he did not expect the right hon. Gentleman to anticipate the decision the Board would come to at their next meeting, he wished to utilise this opportunity to tell him that the Board of which he was the head would sow the seeds of trouble and disorder in that portion of county Kerry and do a great deal of harm to the whole question of land settlement if they persisted in the improper and wrongful policy in which they had engaged in reference to these farms.

*Mr. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory) said they had been falsely led to believe that the Land Act of last year was going to settle the land question. A new vocabulary had been invented for the occasion—words like "appeasement," "reconciliation," and "new eras." As a matter of fact a situation had been created in Ireland that was the most critical for the last twenty-five years. A serious situation had arisen in Ireland, and no one who looked at it from the point of view of the future peace of Ireland could regard it except with misgiving. An attempt was being made to force the tenants into improvident land purchase bargains, and the Estates Commissioners, either from fear or indifference, were doing nothing to save the tenants. The result must be that the Irish tenants would be bound to the English Exchequer by bonds that could not be fulfilled. The probity of the Irish tenant had been vindicated at the Table of the House, but no one could account for the Irish tenant of the future. The hon. Member for South Tyrone had spoken of the congestion in the Appeal Court. That was a most serious situation indeed, for even if no new appeals were lodged in the next five years the Court would not be able to get over the work. The Government ought to see that some remedy was provided for that condition of things. The Sub-commissioners' Courts were not sufficiently manned, and he suggested that the Chief Secretary should increase the number, but not from the sources from which they had hitherto been taken, namely, broken-down landlords and their friends, agents, and retired majors. He knew a Commissioner in Queen's county who was a retired landlord. He was good for nothing as a tenant farmer, and the qualification he had for the office he now held was that latterly he had spent some time in the Militia. His father had left him a good property but he made nothing out of it.

Referring to the work of the Estates Commissioners the hon. Member said the situation was most critical, and what he and his friends most complained of was the inability or hesitation of the Commissioners to do anything for the restoration of the evicted tenants. Whether or not they had power to do so had never been properly explained in this House or in the country. He would give a concrete case in his own county. A tenant was evicted in 1883 for the non-payment of rent up to £210 a year. The landlord let the farm to his nephew for £100 a year. The nephew died and the farm was sold for £545. The situation at present was this. Negotiations were going on, and he understood that they were nearly complete, for the sale of the estate. A communication had been sent to the Estates Commissioners, on behalf of the evicted tenant, asking if they would buy the farm. Had the Commission power to make compensation to the planter or had they not? Perhaps the most serious situation was in connection with Lord Lansdowne's property. He presumed that Lord Lansdowne, as a Member of the Cabinet, had given his consent and approval to all the proposals and contents of the Land Act. But what was the fact? Lord Lansdowne had had fifty-two of his tenants evicted since 1887, and there was no appearance to-day, any more than there was twelve months ago, that single one of these tenants was to be restored to his holding. Had the Estates Commissioners, who were in the pay of the Government, no influence with Lord Lansdowne? Could they not influence him, could they not beg of him to restore the tenants to their holding? Those who had advocated a change in the land system had nothing to be ashamed of, because their action had been fully vindicated by the legislation which had been since passed, and in which Lord Lansdowne had taken a part. The tenants had been turned out of their houses on to the roadside in Queen's county, and, of course, what was wanted was that they should get possession again of their holdings. Was not the John George Adair evictions a case in which the Estates Commissioners should initiate negotiations? There was not otherwise any prospect of that property going into the Court. Landlords retained this right of the hanging gale for no other purpose than to victimise the tenants. He was a tenant farmer himself, and therefore he looked forward to a gloomy prospect if this power were retained by the landlords. A case was lately before Judge Curran in King's county, in which negotiations for sale of the property to the tenants were pending, notwithstanding which the landlord sued the tenants for a year's rent, including the hanging gale. The learned Judge said he was constrained by the strict letter of the law to grant decrees, but to mark his disapproval of the course adopted by the landlord, he placed a stay upon execution and declined to give costs. He warned the House that should those powers to sue for old arrears, including the hanging gale, continue to be used by landlords for the the purpose of forcing the tenants into accepting ruinous terms of purchase, the foundation would be laid for future trouble and discontent in Ireland. He saw the hon. Member for Stoke (Mr. Coghill) in his place. He was concerned for the British taxpayer, so also was he (Mr. Delany) but he was more concerned still for the future of his country.

Mr. HEMPHILL (Tyrone, N.) said he would not attempt to accentuate what had been so fully put forward by the hon. Member as to the total breakdown of the Land Purchase Act, so far as restoring the evicted tenants was concerned. Unquestionably neither the eloquence, nor the sophistry of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary could get over the fact that the restoration of the evicted tenants, which was one of the objects which induced him to support the Bill, had not been effected. He regretted that there were not some more English and Scottish Members present at that particular moment, because they were dealing with a question which involved a Vote of £126,342 for the Land Commission. That was a very large figure, apart from the cost of the other judicial establishments in Ireland. Everyone who read the Irish newspapers knew that appeals were being made which could not be decided in two, three, or four years. The salaries of the Land Commissioners amounted to nearly £17,000 and their duties were to hear appeals and fix fair rents. There must be some great want of attention on the part of the Executive when such a state of things existed. It was said that Mr. Justice Meredith, of whom he could only speak with the greatest respect and admiration, was unable to cope with the work, and that Mr. Justice Fitzgerald, a very experienced man, was not able to cope with it either. Four or five years ago a Bill was introduced to reduce the number of Judges. If the judicial staff of the Land Commission had broken down, why not utilise the other Judges. They were men of great authority and ability, and the discharge of the duties of a Land Judge did not require any special training. None of the present Judicial Commissioners had any special knowledge of land. They were only required to hear and balance the evidence and then decide. He himself was not advocating that course but, at any rate, it took away all excuse for the delay which existed. What had become of Mr. Commissioner Lynch, at £3,000 a year, a most experienced and clever gentleman, although comparisons were odious in connection with gentlemen clothed with quasi-judical functions. Where was Mr. Murrough O'Brien, who was a most energetic and able man, and who was most willing to work? Why was he not utilised? He, himself, had never heard of any charge against Mr

Murrough O'Brien except that he sympathised with the tenants; but it was impossible for any man in a judicial position to harden his heart against that. For fourteen years, he, as a County Court Judge, had to administer the Land Acts. He believed he did justice; but he certainly had sympathy with the tenants. That sympathy, however, did not interfere with his judicial decisions. He would ask the Chief Secretary, why were Mr Murrough O'Brien and Mr. Lynch allowed to lie fallow?

There was another point he desired to mention. It was most unfortunate that the construction of the Land Act should have doubt cast upon it. Many of them who had passed weary nights in passing the Act knew that the bonus was voted for the purpose of inducing the landlords to sell and the tenants to buy at a fair price. That was the intention of Parliament; and, as a lawyer, he was bound to say frankly that he thought that that intention had been carried out. Doubt had, however, been cast upon it in judicial quarters and it was rumoured that that doubt had been rather gratefully received, because of the state of the money market, and because the Government were not over anxious to have too many estates change hands immediately. That, however, might only have been gossip; but there was never smoke without fire. They were now in the month of July; and he would not say that the Chief Secretary had been very active and energetic in amending the Act. Why was it that the sale of untenanted land should be supposed not to carry the bonus? That was not the intention of the Legislature. He confessed that, having regard to the £100,000,000 which was pledged by the Exchequer, and the £12,000,000 in hard cash which was put down, the figures given by the Chief Secretary were not a striking answer to the impeachment brought forward by the hon. Gentleman who initiated the debate.

Mr. WYNDHAM said that no matter how many concrete cases of failure to agree might be brought up, nobody had a right to charge him with having held out expectations which had not been fulfilled. It would be useless and quite improper for him to address homilies either to landlords who were alleged to sue for hanging gales or to tenants who were alleged to have said that they would pay no rent except on sale terms. He had his own opinion about these proceedings, but a more eloquent teaching was to be found in the large sums of money which would pass where landlord and tenant had found it possible to come to agreement than in any words of stricture which he might address to either side. As regarded the alteration made in the staff dealing with the fixing of rents, what had happened was this: Before the Act of last year there were twenty officers whom he would call valuers, twelve inspectors, and fifty-eight sub-commissioners, ninety officials in all, dealing with the fixing of rent. At present ten of these valuers had become assessors, the twelve inspectors and other officers had been transformed into inspectors for purchase, and the fifty-eight sub-commissioners were reduced first to thirty-six, then to thirty, and in October would be further reduced to twenty-five. In October there would be a total of thirty-five officers dealing with rent-fixing against ninety before the Act, but there would be ninety-three officers dealing with purchase, so that there would be altogether 128 paid officials dealing with the land. The Committee need not fear that there would be any undue delay in the fixing of rents where it was desired to fix them. In the year 1899 there were over 30,000 cases outstanding — not appeals. It would have taken the existing staff three or four years to deal with that work. At present there were only 11,000 cases outstanding, and, in his opinion, they could be dealt with in a year.

As to the question whether the Estates Commissioners had power to treat with the landlord for the reinstatement of an evicted tenant, he must express his reluctance to deal with an abstract question of law but he should think the Commissioners had that power. The legal power to do a thing did not always mean the administrative opportunity to do it in each case at any particular moment. He thought the Estates Commissioners ought to concern themselves with those who had the greatest demand on their help. It was not enough to say, "Here is a man evicted in 1882; you must put him back at once." Some regard must be paid to the merits of the case and the relative claims and urgency of other cases. A great deal had been said about pressure being exercised in order to collect arrears. In the case of a man paying a second-term judicial rent there ought not to be many years of arrear. If a man was paying a first-term rent or paying a non-judicial rent and was pressed for arrears—he did not suggest that that would be done—that man could apply for a stay of execution pending the fixing of a rent. In the case of a future tenant who could not get a rent fixed, and supposing undue pressure were brought to bear and he improvidently signed a bargain which it was unlikely he would be enabled to fulfil, there was inspection for security. As to the question whether if a landlord put back an evicted tenant the Estates Commissioners could give help to that tenant, he should certainly think that was the case, making the same reservation against deciding such a point as he had made previously. The Government provided in the Bill that the money might be expended for the benefit or improvement of an estate. If they had only meant improvement they would have said improvement and nothing more. It would, in his opinion, be a very serious thing to retard the progress which was being undoubtedly made under the Land Bill of last year, and, he thought, every encouragement should be given to the landlord and tenant to take advantage of it.

MR. COGHILL (Stoke-upon-Trent) submitted that before they went to a division they were entitled to have an explanation as to why the Irish Land Stock was issued in so extravagant a way. It was issued at the low price of 86 per cent., and was now standing at a premium of £7. He would like to know why it was that Land Stock was now standing at that premium.

MR. WYNDHAM: I cannot answer that Question.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) said it seemed a pity to interfere for the purpose of stopping this discussion, which was really a useful one, but on the following day, in the discussion on the Irish Land Bill, they would travel over much the same ground. They were desirous of having an hour at least for the discussion of the next Vote—the Board of Works Vote—a Vote which had not been discussed for a great many years and which was of vital importance, and he would therefore suggest to the Committee that they should now come to a decision upon this question.

*MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.) called attention to the congestion in the Land Courts and appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to use his influence with the Land Commissioners and endeavour to get them to sit during the Long Vacation.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 112; Noes, 193. (Division List No. 213.)

AYES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N.E.)
Ambrose, Robert
Asquith, Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Austin, Sir John
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beaumont, Wentworth C.B.
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burke, E. Haviland
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Clancy, John Joseph
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay(Galway)
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark).
Dunn, Sir William
Ellice CaptEC(StAndrw'sBghs)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Field, William
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P.(Cavan,W.
Kilbride, Denis
Law, Hugh Alex.(Donegal,W.)

Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leamy, Edmund
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M‘Crae, George
M‘Fadden, Edward
M‘Hugh, Patrick A.
M‘Kean, John
M‘Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M‘Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mooney, John J
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moss, Samuel
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien,Kendal(TipperaryMid.
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien,P.J.(Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor,James (Wicklow,W.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, William
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Reid,Sir R.Threshie (Dumfries)
Rigg, Richard
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Russell, T. W
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Sullivan, Donal
Thompson,Dr.EC(Monagh'nN.
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.)
Wood, James
Woodhouse,SirJT. (Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hon.SirH.
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A.J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt.Hn.J.A.(Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish,V.C.W.(Derbyshire)
Chamberlain,Rt.Hn.J.A.(Worc
Chamberlayne, T.(Sthampton)
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig, Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt.Hon.Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hon. Edw. Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster,PhilipS.(Warwick,S.W.)
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon,Maj.Evans-(Tr'H'mlt's
Greene, HenryD. (Shrewsbury)
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Gunter, Sir Robert
Harris, F.Leverton (Tynem'th)
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heath, James (Staffords.,N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Hoult, Joseph
Hozier, Hon. Jas. Henry Cecil
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kennaway, Rt.Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hon.Geo.T.(Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.(Salop.
Kerr, John
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks. N. R.
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants,Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Lloyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M‘Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M‘Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Majendie, James A. H.
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, W. J.H. (Dumfriessh.
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Middlemore JohnThrogmorton
Milner, Rt.Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell, William (Burnley)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, Hon.J.Scott (Hants.)
Moore, William
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray,Rt.HnA.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George

Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, S.Forde(Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt.Hn. Chas.Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel,Sir HarryS.(Limehouse
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Saunderson, Rt.Hn.Col.Edw.J.
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks
Spear, John Ward
Stanley,Hon.Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart,SirMarkJ.M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C.E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G.E.(Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson-Todd, SirW. H.(Yorks)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

Resolution to be reported.

CLASS II.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £21,773, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of Public Works in Ireland."

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.) said it was six years since the Committee had an opportunity of discussing this particular Vote. The Board of Works was one of the most important institutions in Ireland and at the same time one of the quaintest of administrative curiosities. The Chief Secretary, who was supposed to direct its policy, had no control whatever over the Board—the source from which its inspiration was derived being the Treasury, a Department upon which little pressure could be exercised, and consequently Irish representatives had not been able to get much satisfaction with regard to the Board. It was really a most extraordinary institution. Its ramifications extended in almost every direction; it had its finger in practically every Irish pie. Nobody had a good word to say for it. The Board of Works was not peculiar among Irish Departments in that respect, but the unanimity with which it was denounced was surprising even for Ireland. The only matter with regard to which any satisfaction was felt was its action in the matter of ancient monuments. He agreed that the Board of Works might do very much better, but in respect of the care of ancient monuments its work at any rate was on the whole satisfactory. The public sentiment in Ireland on this question had greatly improved of late, and a general feeling prevailed that the Government should see that Irish antiquities were preserved as well as respected. Through the operation of the Land Act it was expected that a large number of ancient monuments would in course of time come under the care of the Board of Works. For example, there was the Hill of Tara, and he was anxious to know whether Tara, or any portion of it, had come under the care of the Board, and what had been done with it. He suggested that a Return should be presented to Parliament annually giving the number of ancient monuments inspected and acquired by the Board under the Land Act and the expense of keeping them in a proper state of preservation.

He wished now to allude to a matter in connection with the upkeep of Phœnix Park, which was in charge of the Board of Works. There was a storm in Ireland last year, and a number of elms originally planted by Lord Chesterfield were blown down. He did not know whether the remains of those elms had been removed yet. [AN HON. MEMBER: No; they are still there.] His hon. friend informed him they were still there. He thought it was time that the remains of those trees were removed and other trees planted in their place. He also wished to ask a Question in regard to the administration of the Grand Canal. The Grand Canal was one of the most important of their waterways in Ireland, and one of the most valuable. For a number of years this method of transit had been very much neglected, but, thanks to the late Mr. McCann, that canal now promised to be of the greatest possible value in the conveyance of farm produce. He understood that the Board of Works had got at loggerheads with the Canal Company upon the question of tolls. The Grand Canal Company published a statement upon the question and the Board of Works published an answer. There had been a further answer from the Canal Company, who seemed to have come out best. It was of the greatest importance that this canal should be used, to its utmost capacity for the benefit of the farmers and producers in that part of the country, and he urged the Chief Secretary to investigate this dispute, and see if something could not be done to adjust matters so that the canal could be used in the future to its utmost capacity.

The Board of Works was also concerned with the contracts for supplies to the public departments in Ireland. This was a question which had hitherto escaped notice. There had been rather numerous complaints about the unsatisfactory system under which contracts for supplies in the Irish public departments were advertised in local newspapers. He thought that this matter required investigation, and he suggested that the Chief Secretary should inquire into the whole question of these contracts. The contracts for supplies to these institutions were controlled by the Board of Works, and he understood there was a regulation that advertisements for contracts should be inserted in newspapers circulating in the district. Enniscorthy was a town in county Wexford, but that apparently was news to the Board of Works, because the contracts were advertised for in interesting little newspapers published in county Waterford, which did not circulate in Wexford. He would suggest that when the Board of Works were advertising for contracts in relation to Wexford the advertisements should be inserted in newspapers circulating in that county. It was not as if the county had not newspapers of its own, for it had half a dozen which were well written and widely read by the people in the county.

Sir Thomas Esmonde.

In regard to loans, the Board of Works were concerned with the advances made for various public purposes in Ireland. The Committee would be pleased to know that they did excellent business for the Treasury in that connection. The money advanced up to the present amounted to something like £45,000,000 and the interest charged varied from 4 to 6 per cent. It was only lately that the rate had been reduced to 4 per cent. The Board had been charging on the major portion of the loans 5 per cent. That was a very good investment for the Treasury. He thought the time had come when the rate of interest on these loans should be reconsidered, there being a general complaint that it was too high. There was at present under discussion a Labourers Bill. If the difficulty in regard to the labourers was to be solved, advances would have to be made to boards of guardians at a reasonable rate, and he would suggest to the Financial Secretary to the Treasury that consideration should be given to the question whether money could not be advanced at a more reasonable rate of interest than 5 or 6 per cent. It was a matter of universal complaint that great delays took place in dealing with applications from people who wished to borrow money, whether for hay barns, outhouses, or labourers' cottages, and he would suggest that some steps should be taken to expedite the work of the Board in that connection. The same remark applied to the important question of loans for the housing of the working classes in towns. The rate of interest on loans for that purpose was too high. Another difficulty which was experienced by urban authorities carrying out schemes under the Public Health Act arose from their borrowing powers being limited to double the net amount of the valuation of the sanitary district. He would illustrate this by a concrete case. In his own county there was a progressive urban council, who were anxious to provide proper housing for artisans. They had already completed an extensive scheme of artisans' dwellings, and they wanted to go on with another. But if they went on with it their financial resources would be greatly crippled. The net annual value of Enniscorthy was £7,500, and under the rule of the Board of Works their borrowing powers amounted to £15,000. He suggested that this matter should be inquired into, and that the Board of Works should consider whether it would not be possible to widen the borrowing powers of the local authorities in respect of the erection of houses for the labourers and the working classes. It would be perfectly safe to allow borrowing powers up to the extent of five or six times the annual value of these houses. Further, he did not understand why the Board of Works did not allow the urban authorities to raise money on the security of the labourers' and artisans' dwelling already erected. This was a most pressing question indeed in some parts of Ireland; and what he complained of was that they were not given even treatment all round.

He would like to ask what were the relations between the Board of Works, the Board of Agriculture, and the Local Government Board? These seemed to be rather hazy and obscure. Not so very many years ago the harbour authorities on the south-east coast of Ireland were able to obtain from the Board of Works one-third of the cost of harbour improvements, and under these conditions the harbour of Ardmore had been improved, to the great satisfaction of the local fishermen and others. But, for some reason or other, the Board of Works had declared lately that no more money was to be spent for that purpose. He would like to ask the Financial Secretary why it was that these sums of money, to which they were entitled, were no longer available. There was no reason why the fishermen on the south-eastern coast should not be placed on an equality with the fishermen in other parts of Ireland. The fishery in the South-east of Ireland should be encouraged by any reasonable Government. That and boat-building were the oldest industries in Ireland, and had been fostered by the Irish Parliament for 300 years. All the harbours on the south-east coast were connected with the Board of Works. In the case of Wicklow, another loan had to be raised to repair the work of the engineer of the Board of Works. He, himself, crumbled some of the cement with which the pier was constructed with a walking stick. Then, again, at Greystones the harbour works collapsed; but the ratepayers had to pay the loan. The Arklow Harbour was a monumental case of the incapacity of the Board of Works. The pier was built in the wrong place by the Board of Works against local advice, with the result that the harbour silted up. Arklow was the centre of the fishing industry in Ireland; and had the best appointed fishing fleet of any port. As a result of the action of the Board of Works, however, in connection with the harbour, the fishing industry at Arklow was diminishing. There was a good claim for compensation in the case of Arklow and of other harbours. For instance, Arklow wanted a dredger as a result of the mistakes of the Board of Works; and after a tremendous delay the dredger was sent down at a cost of £20 or £30 a week. Then the dredger stopped working; and an engineer was sent down. He sent it away for a change of air to Wicklow, where it was found that it had a rock in its inside. All the time, however, the people of Arklow were paying.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: Why did they pay?

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE said that the hon. Gentleman should not incite them to unconstitutional practices. The Board of Works were making a lot of money out of the Irish taxpayers; and the least they could do was to provide a dredger which would work. The fishing industry had practically doubled in a generation; and it was perfectly monstrous that it should be neglected as it was. Opportunity should be given to the harbours on the south-east coast as was given elsewhere. He begged to move the reduction of the Vote by £100.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item A (Salaries) be reduced by £100."—(*Sir Thomas Esmonde.*)

*THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH, Derbyshire, W.) said that for the short period that he had had the privilege and responsibility of representing the Board of Works he had found the officials of that Department keen and anxious to do their best. They had given him every possible assistance, and any criticisms should be directed not against them but against their representative in that House. He had carefully looked into the matter of the Arklow Harbour. Its condition was, no doubt, one of considerable difficulty, and was a subject requiring the most careful expert consideration. A dredger had been sent to this harbour and a great deal of work had been done by it, and the Harbour Commissioners had no reason to complain of the charges made for the use of it. These charges were confined to the days on which the dredger was actually working. On the broad question he might say that, when the Chief Secretary was of opinion that the Board of Works ought to advance money, they would be only too glad to do what they possibly could to carry out his wishes. They were prepared to help and support the right hon. Gentleman as far as they could in conformity with what they considered was their proper duty to the Exchequer. With regard to the question of loans, he thought the interest had been rather overstated and that the charge for sinking fund had been included. They were bound by exactly the same terms for Public Works Loans in Ireland as in England, with this possible advantage in the case of Ireland, that there was a large number of Acts under which loans were advanced in Ireland in which the rate of interest had been fixed, and that rate, he thought, was an extremely fair one. There was no more delay in advancing the loans than was compatible with the fulfilment of the various statutory obligations. It had been made a matter of complaint, with regard to some contracts, that the advertisements had only appeared in two newspapers in Waterford and not in any London newspaper. He understood that those newspapers were the best for the purpose, but in future they considered it might be advisable not to advertise by this means at all, but to send out the notices to the contractors and people interested.

A NATIONALIST MEMBER: Advertise in *The Times.*

*MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH: And then he hoped they would not be accused of favouritism towards any particular papers. With reference to the question of tolls on the Grand Canal, he was aware there had been some complaint, but it would, he thought, be found that the method of levying tolls which was adopted was the fairest, because they only charged sufficient to meet the necessary expenditure. He pointed out that a sum of a little over £3,000 had been placed in the Estimates for the replanting of trees in Phœnix Park. With regard to the fallen timber, it was being removed as rapidly as possible, and he hoped that before long the work would be completed. With reference to the Hill of Tara, by the Act of Parliament the Board of Works had power only to schedule the monument; the consent of both occupier and owner was required before it could be vested, and the Board of Works had very little power until the monument was vested. The Board were, however, exercising all the powers they had under the Act of Parliament, and he believed he could almost promise that no excavations would be made in the future.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE said that the hon. Member, although he had not given much satisfaction on the general question, had at any rate supplied some most useful information. He had stated that the Treasury would be prepared to meet the Chief Secretary in connection with proposals for the benefit of the fishing population. The bogey of the Treasury being thus laid, the Chief Secretary would have free scope for his benevolent intentions for the protection of the fisheries on the coasts, and the Committee would be glad to hear from the right hon. Gentleman what he intended to do.

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.) said that one of the most pressing cases for the provision of a proper harbour was that of the town of Bangor. It might be a local matter in itself, but it afforded an example of the treatment which was making the people of Ulster feel that the Government were always turning a deaf ear to their claims in order to listen to the demands of the Nationalists in other parts of Ireland. The question of the provision of a harbour at Bangor was brought before the Board of Works two years ago, and at the suggestion of that Department plans and specifications were prepared. After keeping those plans for four months, the Board of Trade told the applicants to turn to the Irish Government for help. Eventually an inspection was held, the justice of the claim admitted, and an offer of £2,500 only out the £10,000 required made. He thought that if the matter had concerned any district other than the Loyalist part of Ireland the claim would not have been so niggardly treated. He appealed to the Government not to continue this method of treatment, but to deal with the loyal Ulster constituencies in as generous a manner as they dealt with Nationalist constituencies in other parts of Ireland.

Mr. WYNDHAM said he noted with satisfaction the prospect held out by the Financial Secretary that if he went to the Treasury for a loan he would not find the coffers empty. There was no justification for the allegation of the hon. Member for North Down that the Treasury had lent money on easier terms to Nationalist districts than to the constituencies in Ulster. There was no time to go into the matter on the present occasion, but on another opportunity he would be able to show that the hon. Member was entirely in error.

Sir THOMAS ESMONDE said that what was wanted was not a loan, but a new Marine Works Bill.

Mr. WYNDHAM said he did not understand the Financial Secretary to say that the Treasury would be able to give a free grant of money which would be necessary for another Marine Works Bill. The Marine Works Act authorised free grants, but they were attached by statute to the scheduled districts.

Sir THOMAS ESMONDE suggested that another Marine Works Bill should be introduced not applicable to the scheduled districts.

TIBET.

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) said that, as he had been asked at Question time to communicate any news received at the India Office with regard to Tibet, he would read to the House the following telegram, which had been received at 5.35 p.m.—

> "Tibetans having refused to evacuate Jong, Macdonald resumed operations at 1 p.m., 5th July, demonstrating only that day. On the morning of 6th July a portion of the Gyangtse town assaulted and our position made good. At 4 p.m., 6th July, wall of Jong breached. Jong assaulted and captured by 6 p.m. Enemy's strength estimated at 5,000. Their losses not known yet. Our estimates (full return not yet received): Killed—32nd Sikh Pioneers, Lieutenant Gurdon; 8th Gurkha Rifles, three men. Wounded—40th Pathans, Lieutenant-Colonel Campbell, Captain Preston; 8th Gurkha Rifles, Lieutenant Grant; 23rd Sikh Pioneers, Lieutenant Mitchell; First Royal Fusiliers, three men—all slightly; about twenty native ranks."

And, it being after half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Resolution to be reported upon Monday next; Committee also report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

SUPPLY [16th Allotted Day].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Jeffreys (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1904-5.

Class II.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £14,371, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Offices of the Chief Secretary in Dublin and London, and of the Inspectors of Lunatic Asylums."

Mr. SLOAN (Belfast, S.) drew attention to the action of the Ballinasloe Asylum Committee in appointing to the post of medical superintendent the junior assistant, Dr. Kirwan, over the head of his senior Dr. Mills. Dr. Mills, who had been acting-superintendent for some four months after the death of Dr. Fletcher, and Dr. Kirwan, his junior assistant, were the only two candidates for the post, and when the applications were being considered by the asylum committee, the chairman, the Bishop of Galway, proposed that the post should be given to Dr. Kirwan, the gentleman who seconded the proposition arguing that inasmuch as 96 per cent. of the inmates of the asylum were Roman Catholics the medical superintendent should also be a Roman Catholic. It was in the power of the Lord-Lieutenant to sanction or refuse to sanction the appointment made by the committee, and the question he desired to ask the Chief Secretary, a question which he previously put across the floor of the House without a satisfactory answer being returned, was for what reason the junior assistant had been promoted over the head of his senior whose qualifications were equal and whose ability was unquestioned. The answer previously given by the Chief Secretary was that the matter was being investigated and that no decision had yet been arrived at. He himself had discovered, however, that when the committee asked for the sanction of the Lord-Lieutenant to the appointment they had made, he wrote to ascertain their reasons for appointing the junior. The committee considered the matter and came to the conclusion that the Lord-Lieutenant had no right to ask for their reasons and therefore refused to give them. The Lord-Lieutenant had apparently acquiesced in this and had sanctioned the appointment. He contended that this appointment was purely the result of religious bigotry, and he wanted a categorical reply from the Chief Secretary to the Question. Was not Dr. Kirwan appointed to this post because he was a Roman Catholic and Dr. Mills was not? This was the work of the Catholic Association at Ballinasloe.

Mr. MACVEAGH (Down, S.) said there was no Catholic Association at Ballinasloe.

Mr. SLOAN retorted that there were members of that organisation on the Ballinasloe Asylum Committee. [Cries of "No, there are not" and "Name one."] The Bishop of Galway was one. [Several Irish Members: No he is not.]

Mr. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.) submitted that the hon. Member had no right to state what was not true when he was told it was not true.

An Hon. Member from the Unionist side here appealed to the Deputy-Chairman for a fair hearing for the hon. Member.

Mr. SLOAN said it was undeniable that the senior medical attendant of the Ballinasloe Asylum was repudiated because he was a Protestant. Only recently they had in Belfast a homily addressed to them by the Lord-Lieutenant on the necessity of showing tolerance, and whilst the Lord-Lieutenant was preaching tolerance to them he was allowing this act of intolerance in Ballinasloe. How could hon. Gentlemen opposite suppose that the Protestants of Ireland would consider the claims of Roman Catholics when they themselves acted in this way. He knew the Chief Secretary was not responsible in this matter, but he was the only person to whom complaints could be addressed in this House. The Lord-Lieutenant had a difficult task to perform, no doubt, but it was not made easier by showing favour to any particular Party, and in raising this question now no hon. Member would consider that he (Mr. Sloan) was out of place. To show the favour shown to Dr. Kirwan, he pointed out that while that gentleman was allowed to remove the British emblem (the Crown) from the stationery used in the asylum and substitute "On the people's service" for "On His Majesty's Service" on the envelopes, when Dr. Mills suspended an attendant, who was subsequently fined by a magistrate £5 for the offence, for maltreating a patient in the asylum the committee censured him, not openly, by reinstating the attendant. Since then he was glad to say that as the result of an inquiry that attendant had had to resign. In this case the Catholic Association had been supreme and bigotry and intolerance triumphant; in this case the Party opposite had proved themselves superior to Dublin Castle and the present Government; but he submitted this matter to the Committee in the hope that they would show their sense of the injustice that had been done by supporting him in the reduction he now moved. He moved that the Vote be reduced by the sum of £100.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £14,271, be granted for the said Service"—(*Mr. Sloan.*)

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.) said he did not see why the Ballinasloe Asylum should not be allowed to choose its own medical superintendent. The Lord-Lieutenant, after a full inquiry into the whole case, did not feel that a sufficiently strong case had been made out to overrule the decision of the committee of that asylum. The asylum was governed by a joint committee elected by the county councils of Galway and Roscommon, but the accusation which had been made was chiefly against the county of Galway. Dr. Mills was the head of the male lunatic department and Dr. Kirwan was at the head of the female lunatics, and their positions were as nearly as possible equal. The Lord-Lieutenant found that one of the doctors was two or three years senior, but he did not say that the committee had acted from a religious point of view. He was glad that in this discussion no reflection had been made upon either of the candidates. As far as the position of the representatives of county Galway were concerned, they had acted simply in the interests of the ratepayers, because the voters were constantly grumbling about the heavy taxation inflicted upon the county, and asking why the asylum cost such a heap of money. There was a feeling that Dr. Mills had not attended the committee meetings as much as he ought to have done. He had no hesitation in stating, upon information he had received from one well acquainted with the facts, that if the case had been reversed, if Dr. Kirwan had been a Protestant and Dr. Mills a Catholic, the election would have gone the same way. The appointment made was well justified. That was a statement which he got from those who knew well the whole of the circumstances, and he believed that the reasons he had given very largely contributed to the majority in favour of Dr. Kirwan. He could not see why the Lord-Lieutenant should step in and override the opinion of the local committee. If such action did take place it might very well be asked, "Why give the Irish people local government at all?" The question raised by the hon. Member for South Belfast was a large one. If the question of religion was to be raised, where would they stop? Ninety-six per cent. of the people of Galway were Catholics and only 4 per cent. were Protestants, yet the Protestants had nearly four-fifths of the good appointments. He was informed that the appointment of Dr. Kirwan was made on grounds of finance.

MR. SLOAN said that reason had never been given by any member of the committee making the appointment.

COLONEL NOLAN replied that although that reason was not given, some of the speeches made by the committee were perhaps of the character indicated by the hon. Member. Some members of the committee disclaimed the question of religion altogether. He did not say that there was anything else against Dr. Mills, but he knew that Dr. Kirwan had been most attentive at the meetings of the finance committee.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON (Armagh, S.) said he always thought that Englishmen forgot one peculiar characteristic of Irishmen, and that was that they were born politicians. No matter in what position in the world they were placed, even in a lunatic asylum they exhibited this qualification. The hon. Member for South Belfast had raised the question of the appointment of the superintendent of an asylum. In England that would be looked upon as a very humdrum and commonplace matter, but in Ireland it was impossible to divest it of questions which cropped up naturally in the Irish mind, because Irishmen were born politicians. Take the case of this asylum board—it was not elected by the lunatics, if it had been it would have been much more sensible—that board went down to the asylum, sat round a table, and, presided over by a Bishop, proceeded to deal with important matters. What was the business they transacted? They took the buttons off all the servants in the institution, because they were aggravated and annoyed, and possibly in a rage, when they saw one of these servants enter their august presence with buttons having on them an Irish harp, and over the harp a crown. At all hazards that crown must come off, and also the buttons. The first duty that Dr. Kirwan had to perform when he was elected superintendent was to interview the contractor in order to get these buttons put right by removing the crown. On the paper of the asylum was stamped the letters "O.H.M.S." Such a thing could never be borne in a lunatic asylum in county Galway, and the asylum board had, he supposed at some expense, succeeded in erasing the objectionable letters, and replacing them by the letters "O.P.S.," which meant "On the People's service". That satisfied the aspirations of this lunacy board. If they had confined themselves to that he would not have said a word. But there was a more important point. The hon. Member for South Belfast, who was a very valuable member of the Party to which he belonged, had spoken about the election of a superintendent. The two candidates were Dr. Mills and Dr. Kirwan. The former had been fourteen years in the service of the asylum, and the latter only seven years; and the former had acted as superintendent for fourteen months during the illness of the former superintendent. Moreover, the board, which was almost entirely composed of Roman Catholic members bore testimony to the great service Dr. Mills had rendered. Notwithstanding all these superior qualifications, Dr. Mills was passed over and Dr. Kirwan appointed. A member of the board said at the time that he supported Dr. Kirwan's candidature because he was a Roman Catholic, and, in fact, this religious consideration was the cause of Dr. Kirwan's appointment. The hon. and gallant Member for Galway disclaimed on the part of Dr. Kirwan's appointment anything of a religious or sectarian character.

COLONEL NOLAN: No, no!

COLONEL SAUNDERSON said that was the impression he derived from the hon. and gallant Member's remarks.

COLONEL NOLAN: What I said was that a large portion of the members of the committee were not guided by religious considerations.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON said that nobody could conceive that a committee deciding between two candidates, one with seven and the other with fourteen years service—the latter being a most distinguished medical practitioner, who had earned the respect of every man who knew him—would have chosen the junior candidate unless they had acted from religious motives. Ninety per cent. of the persons in the asylum were Roman Catholics, and it was as though the board had said to Dr. Mills, who had given up a large part of his life in the service of his country, "Thus far and no further shall you or any Protestant go." That was the tragedy of the matter. When he heard of this extremely unjust action of this asylum board, he wrote to His Excellency the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, but with very little effect. If the hon. and learned Member for Waterford saw a flagrant injustice done to one of his own religion he would make just such a representation to the Lord-Lieutenant.

MR. JOHN REDMOND said that if a friend of his or a co-religionist of his were passed over simply because of his religion he would not dream of interfering on that ground, and he had never made an appeal on that ground during the whole course of his public life.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON said that all he could say was that the hon. and learned Member ought to interfere under such circumstances. This was not a ques- of religion or bigotry, but of gross injustice. [AN HON. MEMBER: - It is a question of a job.] He wrote to the Lord-Lieutenant, and he hoped that under the circumstances the appointment would not have been sanctioned. But his representations did not have the desired effect. Replying to a Question on the subject in the House, the Chief Secretary said the power of appointment was vested in the asylum committee, not in the Government. There was certain power in the Government to veto an appointment, but only in connection with matters of qualification. That was in April, but he did not think the Chief Secretary held that opinion now, because when he was questioned on the 21st of May he said that the right which rested with the Lord-Lieutenant of granting or withholding his concurrence was unconditional, and, in exercising that right, His Excellency discharged a duty imposed upon him by statute and his duty was not restricted to ascertaining whether the candidate appointed had the necessary qualifications, but the circumstances must be considered. The Lord-Lieutenant took advice in Ireland on the subject. [A NATIONALIST MEMBER: Inspector Saunderson's.]

MR. FLAVIN: What qualification had your son for the job?

COLONEL SAUNDERSON said this was a question where there were two Irishmen candidates for a vacancy, and one who had served seven years was put over the head of the other who had served twelve years, and the only reason was that he was a Roman Catholic. [A NATIONALIST MEMBER: How long did your son serve?] This was an act of flagrant injustice to a man who naturally had every reason to believe in the circumstances that when a vacancy occurred he would be appointed. But no, because he was a Protestant he was passed over. [NATIONALIST cries of "No."] No one had a single word against the reputation of Dr. Kirwan or Dr. Mills, but Dr. Kirwan was chosen because it was said that 90 per cent of the lunatics were Roman Catholics. This was a far more important matter than the mere appointment of a superintendent of an Irish lunatic asylum. It showed the forces that were now at work in Ireland. Hon. Gentlemen opposite would not deny it. They had all heard of the Catholic Association which had for its purpose to secure for Roman Catholics all that could be obtained, and the boycotting of every Protestant not only from posts, but in trade. [NATIONALIST cries of "No."] That was the avowed object of the association, but when hon. Members found that it caused an outcry in the country undoubtedly they turned a cold shoulder on it. But the association still existed. A meeting of the Maynooth Union was addressed by the most Rev. Dr. Hogan who said that all that they wanted was an organisation with branches in every parish and district in the country well disciplined, well officered, and supplied with a fund to meet emergencies.

MR. HAYDEN (Roscommon, S.): I rise to order. I wish to know whether it is in order on the Chief Secretary's salary to discuss the proceedings of the Maynooth Union.

*THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I understood the right hon. Gentleman was discussing a union which is under the Vote.

MR. HAYDEN: I may explain that the Maynooth Union is a union of ex-students of Maynooth College, and that it in no way comes under this Vote.

*THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The right hon. Gentleman would be out of order in discussing that.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON said he bowed to that ruling. What he wanted to show was that at Ballinasloe an act of flagrant injustice had been done and that it was part of a general policy adopted in Ireland.

MR. WYNDHAM said if his hon. and gallant friend was attacking him in connection with a particular act at Ballinasloe Lunatic Asylum he should prefer that the charge should be stated as it was one to which he should like to reply.

*THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is not the point. The right hon. Gentleman is quite in order in attacking the policy of the Chief Secretary or the Government, but I do not think he is in order in going into too much detail on minor points which do not directly affect the Chief Secretary.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON said he believed that the Government had not appreciated the condition of affairs in Ireland and were not aware of the organisation which existed in that country, and which had its fruition at Ballinasloe. As the Chairman had ruled that that was not in order he would not pursue the subject. The appointment made at Ballinasloe was a small affair to the House of Commons, but it was a great and sad affair to the man whose career had been blighted. This pointed the direction in which the wind blew in Ireland.

MR. FLAVIN: It has been blowing in your direction for a long time.

*THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I hope hon. Gentlemen will not make these interruptions, otherwise it is impossible to carry on debate.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON said peace could never be secured in Ireland except by the action of the people themselves, and the exercise of fair play and toleration on the part of the different religious bodies. No evidence that would stand sifting in that House could be brought against the Protestant minority showing that they had discarded a Roman Catholic simply because he was a Roman Catholic and had put a junior secretary over his head. A gulf dug by bigotry separated two religious classes and anyone who desired to keep that gulf open deserved ill of Ireland.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN (Kilkenny, N.) said that after listening to the speech of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman one would have imagined that they were not in the House of Commons, but in the Ballinasloe Lunatic Asylum. He had never in his experience of the House of Commons witnessed a more grotesque exhibition than that to which the House had just been treated. The facts of the case were that there was a vacancy in the lunatic asylum for a medical superintendent and there were two candidates. One was senior to the other; but the junior candidate had greater qualifications—[MINISTERIAL cries of "No"]—and he received the appointment. Dr. Kirwan had the special advantage of being a Galway man, and naturally the people of the county were inclined to give this appointment to the man whose qualifications exceeded those of the other candidate, and whose only limitation was that he was junior by two or three years. This board, which had been pilloried in all the Unionist papers in England, and had been held up to odium by the orators, of whom the right hon. and gallant Gentleman and his friends were the chief guides, had given an addition of salary to the gentleman who did not receive the appointment. That board was charged in this House with being a sort of bigoted institution for the persecution of Protestants. In another case they gave an advance of salary of £10 a year to Dr. Collins, a Protestant official, but the Local Government Board refused to sanction it. He would ask those who had listened to this tirade of abuse from the hon. and gallant Gentleman—a tirade which they heard on every occasion when Irish questions were dealt with in this House—whether this farce should not end. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman was getting very old, almost as hoary as the jokes and witticisms which he had imposed on the House during the long period he had been the chief prop of foreign ascendancy in Ireland. Because the policy which the right hon. and gallant Gentleman supported was disappearing before the breath of a new and tolerant spirit, he and his Party came here and assailed a nation, and impeached the honour of the people. He would ask the right hon. Gentleman how many Roman Catholics held offices of trust under the Corporation of the City of Belfast, where one-third of the population were Roman Catholics. Was there a single appointment held there by a Catholic? Turning to the right hon. Gentleman's own constituency, he asked how many Catholics held positions of trust in Portadown. The hon. Member for South Antrim smiled. He would ask him how many Catholics held appointments in Lurgan, where half the population were Catholics. [AN HON. MEMBER: It is not.] Yes, half the population of Lurgan were Catholics, and yet it was absolutely impossible for a Catholic to get an appointment in the gift of an elected body in that town. If the right hon. Gentleman was not responsible for this condition of things, he at least knew that it operated wherever his Party was placed in power, and he should be the last man to come here and impeach a public authority of the character of the Ballinasloe Board of Guardians, and attack a whole race for action which was perfectly excusable and absolutely defensible.

He rose not to discuss the Ballinasloe case but for the purpose of dealing with another matter, which involved an infamous attack on the tolerant spirit of the Catholics of Ireland. The attack had been based on a recent occurrence in that country. Had the hon. Member for South Antrim ever heard of Constable Anderson? From what had been appearing in the newspapers he expected the hon. Member to come there and impeach the Chief Secretary and the representatives of the Government in Ireland because of the dismissal and subsequent proceedings in connection with the case of Constable Anderson. The hon. Member had told them that a gross outrage against liberty had been perpetrated in that case.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.): Hear, hear!

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN said the hon. Member could say "Hear, hear," but why was he compelled to force him to defend the policeman who was said to be the victim of an organised conspiracy on the part of Catholics? Hon. Gentlemen opposite, by Questions and insinuations in that House, and by speeches on Orange platforms, and other arenas of public activity, had told them of the villainy of Sir Antony MacDonnell, of the part he had played in this tragedy or comedy, and of the outrageous way in which Anderson had been treated because he was a Protestant. Well, this was the House of Commons. This was not an Orange platform at Portadown, nor was it the Custom House steps at Belfast. If hon. Members wished to impeach the Chief Secretary, this was the place to do it. Nationalist Members had no reason to defend the right hon. Gentleman, but with all his limitations he had always the courage to come there and face the music, and he was present that night to face even Orange music. Why did not the hon. Member for South Antrim, who had made a record for himself as a great statesman, rise and say in this House what he had stated outside?

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: The hon. Member is going to rise as soon as the hon. Gentleman has finished.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN said that what he wanted to ask was why are hon. Gentlemen opposite hiding behind the Ballinasloe Lunatic Asylum? Why had not hon. Gentlemen opposite brought forward this case in the House as they had threatened to do? Why had his hon. friend the Member for South Tyrone——

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: Do not bring me into the case.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN said he was very glad that there were some things that the hon. Member wanted to be out of. But the hon. Gentleman would permit him to refer, in a friendly way, to those who were hiding behind the Ballinasloe Lunatic Asylum. Why had hon. Gentlemen opposite shirked the responsibility of bringing the whole of this case before the House? He and his friends did not impeach Constable Anderson; he was impeached before a tribunal composed of policemen, and the prosecutor was a policeman. The result of that inquiry was that Constable Anderson was dismissed. He did not call in question the judgment of such a tribunal which said that Constable Anderson was guilty; but immediately hon. Gentlemen opposite proceeded to say that it was because Constable Anderson was a Protestant that he had been dismissed. The hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh immediately proceeded to raise the war-cry that a gross outrage had been committed, and a great wrong done to a worthy officer, and demanded that the constable should be reinstated, irrespective of the merits of the case. Neither he nor his friends desired to raise the question, although they knew that the constable had been rightly convicted. But hon. Gentlemen opposite immediately proceeded to say that the constable had been dismissed because he was a Protestant, and to denounce everyone connected with the case. He invited the hon. Member for South Antrim, who had taken a leading part in this matter, to demand a complete inquiry. The Chief Secretary had been attacked for reinstating this man. Why did those who attacked not formulate their charges? He was not there to attack Constable Anderson, but to discuss the merits of the case, and to protest with all his strength against this conspiracy to hold up the Irish people as bigots who would not allow Protestants to live in Ireland, and to malign his dear friend Father O'Hara—one of the most tolerant and generous-hearted Catholic priests in Ireland. This was not a case in which politics should be allowed to play any part. All he wanted was that the whole matter should be probed to the bottom.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG said that there was not time to take up the case that evening [Cries of "Oh, oh!" from the IRISH Benches, and an HON. MEMBER: You run away from it.] He was very sorry that he could not oblige hon. Members opposite; but the representatives of the Government in charge of the Vote were aware of the reasons for not taking up the case that evening. On another day hon. Gentlemen would probably hear more of it than they wanted.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Do I understand that a special day has been promised to hon. Members opposite for the discussion of this case?

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: No; the hon. Member, however, is well aware that a third day is to be given to the Irish Estimates, and that then Irish questions would be confined to those that could be raised on the Chief Secretary's salary. [Cries of "No, no!" from the IRISH Benches.]

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Nothing of the kind. You have lost your chance, and you know it.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: I can assure the hon. Gentleman we have no intention of running away.

AN HON. MEMBER on the IRISH Benches: Tackle it now.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG said that he would not tackle it on that occasion. He would refer to it on the third day of the Irish Estimates. He proposed now to return to the salubrious town of Ballinasloe. He had a paper of 16th May which contained a full report of the convention held in that town, and no one who read it would deny that Dr. Kirwan was elected on purely religious grounds. This was a case which should be decided in the full light of day. The Lord-Lieutenant, acting on the advice either of the Chief Secretary or of the Under-Secretary, and in spite of the fact that the asylum committee refused to give any reasons for their superseding one official by another, confirmed this appointment. This was regrettable, for the case from start to finish had raised very bitter feeling in the North of Ireland. The Ulster Unionists were a small Party, but they would be wanting in their duty not only to their constituents, but to the country, if they failed to make this protest. The man who was responsible for so much of what they considered bad and unfair government in Ireland was the Under-Secretary. A permanent civil official had no right to act except on the orders of his superiors. The House should be told what connection Sir Antony MacDonnell had had with this case. What correspondence had passed between him and the Bishop of Raphoe or the Archbishop of Tuam? What were the considerations or motives which had decided either the Chief Secretary or the Under-Secretary to give consent to this abominable job?

*MR. LONSDALE asked leave to say that, as secretary of the Irish Unionist Party, he made a distinct arrangement with the Chief Unionist Whip that a whole day should be given for the discussion of the Anderson case on the Chief Secretary's salary when Irish Estimates were again put down.

MR. JOHN REDMOND said that statement came upon him as a complete surprise, and was at variance with the statement made to him on behalf of the Government.

MR. WYNDHAM said that so far as he was acquainted with the arrangement for taking the Irish Votes, he thought the hon. Member for Mid Armagh must be in error in supposing that the Chief Government Whip had made such an astonishing promise as that a whole day was to be devoted to the discussion of a single case. He could not have given any undertaking of the kind.

MR. JOHN REDMOND said his relations with the Chief Secretary on matters of this kind had always been most pleasant and straightforward, and he should be sorry if any misunderstanding were to arise in the present instance. He had protested against the Vote for the Chief Secretary's salary being taken that night, but the right hon. Gentleman insisted on having an opportunity of defending himself against the personal attacks made upon him. Any understanding with the Irish Unionists that the Vote should be put down again would be a gross breach of faith with him, of which he was sure neither the Chief Secretary nor the Chief Whip would be guilty.

*MR. LONSDALE said there could be no question that the Chief Whip informed him that a day and a half would be given for the discussion of the Chief Secretary's salary, and on that understanding it was arranged that the Anderson case should not be raised that night, when there would not have been time for a full debate.

MR. WYNDHAM said that perhaps the hon. Gentleman would raise the question on the adjournment of the House, if there was any dispute between him and the Chief Whip. In the course of the debate reference had been made to the comedy and tragedy which went hand in hand in Ireland. That was so. In the speeches on both sides there were phrases that moved them to laughter and phrases which brought home to them how sad was the heritage of Ireland with respect to sectarian animosity. He appreciated the brilliant humour with which that tragedy had been relieved in the course of the debate, but he also felt the tragedy. The Chief Secretary intervening in such a debate must adopt a part which was tiresome because it was a part so detached from the passion and feelings which animated the Irish representatives on both sides of the House. What was the foundation of the charge which had been made in various quarters outside the House that he and that most distinguished public servant who was associated with him, Sir Antony MacDonnell, were actuated in the discharge of their duty by improper motives? The standing committee of an Irish county council recently appointed two officers—one a medical superintendent and the other an assistant medical officer. The first appointment they were competent to make under the Local Government Act, and the second appointment they were not competent to make, inasmuch as under the rules of that Act the officer must be unmarried, and the candidate they proposed to appoint was married. In the first case he—not Sir Antony MacDonnell—advised that it was the duty of the Unionist Minister of a Unionist Government to carry out in the spirit and the letter a Unionist Act of Parliament; in the second case, as the Minister responsible for the upholding of law in Ireland, he advised that the appointment was improper and could not be sanctioned. To found on those cases the charge that the Irish Administration was animated by sectarian bigotry was really a deplorable use of imagination. He knew that in many parts of Ireland, and, by reflex action in this country, there were persons who honestly believed that there was a widespread movement to drive Protestants out of all positions, public and private, in Ireland. He did not think it himself. He did not say that in no case were elected representative bodies actuated by such considerations; he knew they were. He was sorry for it. It would be far better if they had a single eye to the merits of the candidate. He deprecated going into motives in matters of this sort, but one was almost forced to do so. He had given to the section of the Act his unbiassed and careful consideration; he had consulted his legal advisers, and also the authors of the Act of 1898, and he was convinced that under Section 84 of the Local Government Act it was the duty of the committee of the county council to make this appointment, to appoint a properly qualified man, that the Lord-Lieutenant had the right to give or withhold his concurrence, and that that right was not limited to seeing that the statutory qualifications were fulfilled. But was that right so large as to amount to a repeal of the section, because the demand now made, however, practically amounted to this, that the Chief Secretary should repeal the section and should be the person to make the appointment? Could anyone imagine the President of the Local Government Board in England being asked to consider an appointment of this kind?

Mr. SLOAN asked the right hon. Gentleman to explain how it was then that the Lord-Lieutenant thought it right to ask for the reasons why the junior was elected over the senior.

Mr. WYNDHAM said it was because he agreed that the selection of the junior officer was a somewhat startling fact, and it placed upon the Government the duty of satisfying themselves whether the statutory requirements were fulfilled Inquiry was made, which satisfied them that the man actually selected was qualified, and then after careful consideration of the provision in the Act of 1898, he came to the conclusion which he. had announced. He found himself at difference on many points with the position taken up in the past by the Unionist Party in Ireland and their historical predecessors, but at the same time he could understand the view they had taken. For instance, some opposed Catholic Emancipation; he differed from them, but he could understand their position. Some thought the extension of the franchise a mistake; he differed from them, but he could understand their positition. Some thought the Local Government Act was a mistake; he differed from them, but he could understand their position. But when he came to the point that full local government had been given to Ireland in 1898, and that a legislative gift given with one hand should in administration be withdrawn by the other, he confessed he could not understand the position. By that method of procedure there would be given the worst form of local government that could be given to any country, a far worse form than was superseded in Ireland. If he attempted to do the duties which had been delegated to the county councils, it would cease altogether to be local government; it would be government by a British Minister whose time was largely occupied with branches of Irish and Imperial business. Was it conceivable that any man in his position who wished to do his duty would take on himself the responsibility, having to give attention to many other matters, of deciding why a local body selected one man for an appointment instead of another? His responsibility began and ended in seeing that the law had been fulfilled, and had not been broken by a body to whom powers had been delegated by Parliament.

Mr. WILLIAM MOORE (Antrim, N.) said this was not merely a question of the appointment of a medical superintendent, it was a case which tested the principle whether under local government in Ireland a gentleman should by reason of his religion be prevented from enjoying the natural profits of his profession in the land of his birth. The responsibility did not rest altogether with the local body, for the Lord-Lieutenant had the power of approval, and without that approval the law made the election invalid. The Lord-Lieutenant had that controlling power that he might prevent injustice. A question of fact had to be considered. Did this appointment proceed on the lines of natural justice or of injustice? He submitted that it was a dereliction of duty on the part of the Lord-Lieutenant not to exercise his controlling power.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.) called attention to the fact that under a rule of the House the Acts of the Lord-Lieutenant could not be criticised except on a special Motion.

THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN said that that was so, and the hon. Member would not be in order in pursuing the subject.

MR. WILLIAM MOORE said that what he was really criticising was the Chief Secretary and the advice he gave to the Lord-Lieutenant. The Irish Government were so startled by the appointment that they actually went through the form of asking for reasons. The board refused to give reasons, and yet the appointment was confirmed. Therefore, the Executive Government was responsible equally with the county council. This was not merely a question of what had happened at Ballinasloe; it was a question of how the Local Government Act was to be worked in remote country districts. Was the House going to allow the Local Government Act to be worked for the exclusion of Protestants? He contended that he and his friends were right to bring the case before the House. So long as he was a Member of the House he should always, no matter what the consequences, assist his hon. friends in fastening blame on the Irish Executive where it rested with them.

MR. JOHN REDMOND complained that the Chief Secretary, after overriding his protest and putting down his Vote on the ground that he might have the earliest opportunity of repelling a personal attack, had not alluded to the Anderson case. His silence gave colour to the suggestion that an arrangement had been made behind the backs of the Irish Party that the third day of the Irish Estimates should be devoted to that subject. Although the Anderson case had not been raised on the other side of the House, it had been raised by the hon. Member for Kilkenny, and in a way which gave the right hon. Gentleman the opportunity which he said he was seeking. That being so, and the Vote having been put down for the specific purpose, he thought they had reason to complain that the right hon. Gentleman should have sat down without saying a word on the matter. He would like to hear whether it was true that the Government had promised a third day of Irish Supply to enable these Gentlemen who had not opened this case to do so then. If that were so, away to the winds went the arrangement which had governed the management of Supply for a long time past, and it would be necessary to bring the matter before the House and the Prime Minister to see whether the pretence of taking Supply in the order which Members interested in it desired was to be kept up any longer, or whether in the case of Irish Supply arrangements were to be made in contravention of the understanding, and behind the backs of the Irish Party.

MR. WYNDHAM said he spoke till a quarter to twelve and could not deal with the Anderson case in a quarter of an hour when it had not been brought before him by those who had expressed their intention of making the attack. He was sorry it was not brought before him as he was perfectly prepared to deal with it.

*THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Sir A. ACLAND-HOOD, Somersetshire, Wellington) said the arrangement made was that the Land Commission and the Board of Works Votes should be taken at the afternoon sitting, and that the Chief Secretary's salary should be put down for nine o'clock. He understood then that it was the desire of Irish Unionist Members to discuss the case of Constable Anderson. On Monday night he was informed that the three hours of the evening sitting were not considered adequate for the discussion. He saw the Chairman of the Irish Unionist Party, who said he considered three hours sufficient for the discussion. He therefore came to the conclusion that the arrangement which had been announced to the House must be adhered to. It would be impossible to carry on the business of Supply unless arrangements, when made, were adhered to. A letter which had been published in the Press was sent to him, and in his reply, which he thought ought also to be published, after stating the arrangement which had been made and the necessity for carrying it out, he pointed out that in this session it was proposed to give not only an evening sitting to the Vote for the Chief Secretary's salary, but to put the Vote down as first Order on the last day of Irish Supply. In doing that he believed he was carrying out what the hon. and learned Member for Waterford asked him to do

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: Oh, no; quite the contrary.

***Sir A. ACLAND-HOOD** said his recollection of the conversation with the hon. and learned Member was that the Vote should be put down as first Order on the last day of Irish Supply because there were many questions in which hon. Members opposite were greatly interested and which they would wish to bring up on that Vote. But he made no suggestion that the case of Constable Anderson should be brought up. In fact, it was impossible for him to do anything of the kind, as it was within the absolute discretion of the Chairman to call on any Member he chose, and that Member could bring forward whatever matter he liked. He had given no pledge to either side as to the course the debate should take, but, in somewhat difficult circumstances, he had endeavoured to carry out his undertaking to the best of his ability.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND rose to speak.

And, it being Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

COUNTY OF SUFFOLK BILL.

Read a second time, and committed to a Select Committee of Seven Members, Three to be nominated by the House and Four by the Committee of Selection.

Ordered, That all Petitions against the Bill presented Five clear days before the meeting of the Committee be referred to the Committee; that the Petitioners praying to be heard by themselves, their Counsel, or Agents be heard against the Bill, and Counsel heard in support of the Bill.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That Three be the Quorum.—(*Sir Cuthbert Quilter.*)

Adjourned at six minutes after Twelve o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Friday, 8th July, 1904.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—Rotherham Corporation; Selby Urban District Council.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

Strabane, Raphoe, and Convoy Railway Bill. A witness ordered to attend the Select Committee.

Lytham Improvement Bill, Reported, with Amendments.

Ulster Electric Power Bill [H.L.]. The Lord BALFOUR informed the House that the Promoters do not intend to proceed further with the Bill. The order of the 21st of April last discharged. Ordered, That the Bill be not further proceeded with.

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill; Barnet District Gas and Water Bill. Leave given to the Select Committee to adjourn over Monday next.

North Western Electricity and Power Gas Bill. Read 3^{a}, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Southport and Lytham Tramroad (Extension of Time) Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

Clyde Valley Electrical Power Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Birkdale Improvement Bill; Crystal Palace District Gas Bill. Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

Strabane, Raphoe, and Convoy Railway Bill. Message to the Commons for the Right Honourable George Wyndham, Chief Secretary for Ireland (a Member), to be examined as a witness before the Select Committee of this House.

Hamilton Gas Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. Committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Tuesday next.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]; Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. Amendments reported (according to order), and Bills to be read 3^{a} on Monday next.

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]; Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [H.L.]. Read 3^{a} (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Education Board Provisional Order (Cardiff) Bill. House in Committee (according to order); Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3^{a} on Monday next.

Leith Corporation Tramways Order Confirmation Bill. Brought from the Commons and read 1^{a}; to be printed; and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899), deemed to have been read 2^{a} (The Lord Kintore (*E. Kintore*)), and reported from the Committee. (No. 137.)

Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Provisional Order Bill. Moved, That the order made on the 14th day of March last, "That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 16th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2^{a}; agreed to; Bill read 2^{a} accordingly and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Tuesday next.

GREAT EASTERN RAILWAY BILL.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3^{a}."—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

On Question, Bill read 3^{a}.

*THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL AND PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (The Marquess of LONDONDERRY): My Lords, perhaps I may be allowed, in moving an

Amendment to this Bill, to say a few words on behalf of the Post Office. My noble friend the Postmaster-General considered that it would be disrespectful to your Lordships' House if his Department did not explain why they have taken the course followed in regard to this Bill. I gather from the Postmaster-General that a mutual agreement has been arrived at between the Post Office and the Great Eastern Railway Company with regard to the proposed Amendment, but my noble friend the Acting Chairman of Committees holds the opinion that it might have been possible for the Post Office to have proceeded in this matter by means of a public Bill. If they had considered it possible to get a Bill passed in their interests on these grounds during the present session, they would undoubtedly have taken that course; but they considered that at this stage of the session, and in view of the various important matters before Parliament, it would have been futile to have proceeded in that way.

But I would point out on behalf of the Postmaster-General, that it is very important that his Department should assert their rights in connection with traffic of all sorts and kinds. The Department fully recognise that in all probability it will be some time before the motor system is developed to its fullest extent, and until that is the case it may not be the duty of the Post Office to take advantage generally of that system of transport for their mails; but they also feel that they should lose no time in asserting the rights they undoubtedly have of making use of all kinds of locomotion. The Postmaster-General is extremely anxious that every respect should be paid to your Lordships' House, and has asked me, therefore, to make these few remarks in moving the following Amendment—

"And whereas it has been agreed between the Company and the Postmaster-General that the following provisions shall apply with respect to the conveyance of mails by omnibuses, coaches, carts, and other road vehicles, be it therefore enacted that—

(1) The Company shall convey by any omnibus, coach, cart, or other road vehicle provided, worked, or used on a regular or periodical service in connection with, or in extension of, their railway system, and habitually moved by mechanical power, all such mails (with the officers of the Post Office in charge thereof) as may be tendered by the Postmaster-General for conveyance by such vehicle, and shall receive and deliver such mails from or to any Post Office or officer of the Post Office on the route of such vehicle."

Then follow conditions with which I do not think I need trouble your Lordships. I beg to move the Amendment.

Amendment moved—

"That this clause be there inserted."—(*The Marquess of Londonderry*).

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH): My Lords, I think it would be right for me to say a few words as to the reason which has induced me to insist that this Amendment should be moved in the House rather than be put in before me when presiding over an Unopposed Bill Committee. One of the clauses in this Bill provides for the running by the Great Eastern Railway Company of certain motor-car services supplemental to the services on the railway, and though this proposal is novel, I believe that it will be, generally speaking, a convenience to the public in those parts of the country where it is found suitable to adopt it. It will be mostly with the object of meeting the requirements of excursionists and others, and it will be very often only an intermittent service. But in consequence of this power being taken by the Great Eastern Railway Company, the Postmaster-General suggested to me, through one of the officers of his Department, that the provisions of the Act of 1893 should be extended to this Bill, and that it should be made compulsory upon companies, and this company amongst them, when providing motor services to carry in those vehicles the mails and the servants of the Post Office in charge of them. That was proposed as a compulsory obligation. It is, as your Lordships know, compulsory now upon the railway companies to carry mails and servants of the Post Office either upon their ordinary trains or upon their light railways or tramways.

The company in question contested the justice of making the Act of 1893 apply to motor-car services of railway companies upon the ground that the circumstances were essentially different.

They were seeking for no monopoly, they were not laying down special tracks or getting Parliamentary powers to make roads; they were simply, as members of the public, using the roads which were provided by the community, and they argued that the only object of Clause 41 of the Bill—the clause now before your Lordships—was to legalise their doing a thing which they wanted to do in the interests of the company. I took that view, and I told the Postmaster-General that, in my opinion, if he wanted legislation of this kind it should be by a public Act, and not by making a precedent in what was otherwise an unopposed Bill.

I took that view mainly on the ground that the motor-car service which it is proposed to establish is essentially different from the general service of trains, inasmuch as there is not the same accommodation, certainly not the same accommodation to spare. Secondly, there is no monopoly given to the railway company for this service, and under those general conditions under which this traffic is carried on the granting to the Postmaster-General of this compulsory power might be placing a very unfair burden on the railway company. On these grounds I refused to insert the clause, but the railway company and the Post Office, I will not say behind my back, but after the decision I had given, agreed between themselves that the clause which is now before your Lordships—an agreement clause—should be inserted in this Bill. I then said that I thought, as this was the first occasion that such a proposal had been made, it should not be accepted by me even though it was agreed to by the parties, but should be moved in the House so that your Lordships should know what was done.

I do not offer any objection to the insertion of this clause, but I think your Lordships will agree with me that when a new precedent of this kind is made it should be done on due notice, so that the whole House may know what is being done. I do not altogether agree with some of the statements made by the noble Marquess. He stated that the Post Office had undoubtedly power to insist on this service under the existing law. It is precisely because they have not that power that they are seeking the insertion of this clause. All I wish to say is that as this is an agreement clause it must not, of course, be taken to form a precedent to be compulsorily imposed on all railway companies who come to Parliament for these services. As the clause in question is an agreement clause and the House has had an opportunity of considering it, I do not propose to offer on this occasion any opposition to the Amendment.

On Question, Amendment agreed to; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

PETITIONS.

SUPPLY OF ELECTRICITY BILL [H.L.].

Petition to be heard by Counsel against; of Association of County Councils in Scotland; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

COLONIES (ANNUAL).

No. 419. Wei-hai-Wei (Report for 1903).

JUDICIAL STATISTICS (IRELAND) 1903.

Part II. Civil Statistics.

SLAUGHTERING OF ANIMALS.

Report of the Committee appointed by the Admiralty to consider the humane slaughtering of animals; together with minutes of evidence, appendices, and index.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3209. Brazil (Porto Allyre).
No. 3210. Portugal (Pete).
No. 3211. Portugal (Chinde).
No. 3212. Japan.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

NEW BILL.

PUBLIC HEALTH BILL [H.L.].

A Bill to enable regulations to be made for carrying into effect conventions with respect to the prevention of danger arising to public health from vessels, and the prevention of the conveyance of infection by means of vessels—Was presented by the Earl Waldegrave (for the Marquess of Lansdowne); read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Tuesday next. (No. 138.)

LIGHT RAILWAYS BILL [H.L.].

Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

HALL-MARKING OF FOREIGN PLATE BILL.

House in Committee (according to order); Bill reported without Amendment; and re-committed to the Standing Committee.

STAFF APPOINTMENTS.

LORD HENEAGE rose to call attention to the present Army Regulations in regard to staff and extra-regimental duties, the non-seconding of officers above the rank of captain in the artillery and cavalry, and the retention of officers in successive appointments on the staff for unlimited periods; and to move to resolve: "That, in the opinion of this House, the present system limits the number of officers duly qualified for staff appointments, is most unfair to regimental officers, and is prejudicial to the best interests of the Army." He said: My Lords, in bringing this question again before the attention of your Lordships I do not propose to retraverse the whole ground, because the late Under-Secretary of State for War, in reply to me last year, did not attempt to answer any of the statements I then made, but simply entered a *non possumus* attitude on the part of the Secretary of State. I intend to-day to call your Lordships' attention to the very unsatisfactory reply given me last year, and which was entirely based on erroneous facts and figures. The questions which I asked your Lordships to consider last year were whether it was not advisable (1) that more officers should be allowed to pass through the Staff College for shorter periods; (2) that all officers on the staff should be seconded, especially in the cavalry and artillery, and (3) that there should be more frequent interchange of duties between regiments and the staff.

Now, my Lords, what was the reply that I received from the noble Earl, Lord Hardwicke, last year? He first of all said that as the whole Staff College question was under Sir Henry Hildyard's consideration he could say nothing, and I admit that that was a perfectly fair and reasonable reply. He then went on to say that they could not increase the number of staff officers as they would not have staff employment for them, and that though my Motion would, in the opinion of the military advisers of the War Office, very much increase the efficiency and discipline of the Army, the cost rendered it prohibitive. Now, my Lords, I desire to call your attention to facts and figures, all of which ought to have been known to the War Office at that time. First, I will deal with the question of the increase in the number of staff officers. The evidence of Lord Roberts and of other generals before the War Commission proved clearly three facts:—(1) That there were not sufficient staff officers; (2) that whilst some were efficient others did not know their work; and (3) that the regimental officers who were commandeered for the staff did their work very well, soon became efficient and were in no degree inferior to the general body of Staff College men. That, I think, is a very strong argument in favour of a greater interchange between the regiments and the staff, and of a larger number of officers being passed through the Staff College to qualify for staff work.

The Royal Commission considered the evidence of Lord Roberts of such importance that in Paragraph 95 of their Report, page 53, they gave his evidence textually. They state that after referring to an absence of a definite system of staff duties, leading sometimes to neglect of indispensable precautions, the gallant Field-Marshal went on to say that—

> "Officers were often called upon to take up duties of which they had no previous knowledge; but whilst it was remarkable in the great majority of cases how quickly they became efficient, the mistakes that were made by the staff had most serious consequences. Many instances of indifferent staff work might be quoted, and it seems clear that the whole staff should be thoroughly trained, that a definite

system of carrying out staff duties should be laid dawn, and that we should have enough trained staff officers to supply, in case of emergency, a large Army."

That was precisely what I asked for in my Motion last year. The noble and gallant Field-Marshal went on to say—

"Staff officers cannot be improvised, nor can they learn their duties like the rank and file in a few weeks or months, for their duties are as varied as they are important."

And the noble and gallant Earl further said—

I am decidedly of opinion that we cannot have a first-rate Army unless we have a first-rate staff, well educated, constantly practised in manœuvres, and with wide experience."

This was supplemented by Lord Kitchener, who said—

"The officers on the staff were very mixed. Some were excellent, whilst others had no staff training and had everything to learn. There was no reserve of qualified staff officers to fill vacancies."

Now, my Lords, I will only quote one more passage from the evidence of Lord Roberts. It is in reference to regimental officers, who have come in for so much unmerited censure, and his opinion is amply endorsed by other general officers. Lord Roberts said—

"There were certain failures among them in South Africa, but, so far as my knowledge of history goes, the general standard of practical knowledge, of devotion to duty, and of readiness under difficulties, was at least as high as in any army which I have known or of which I have read . . . It was seldom that they displayed any want of initiation, and their knowledge of their duties in the field left little to be desired."

It requires no further words from me, after these quotations, to urge the importance of more staff officers; but I would further point out that both Lord Roberts and General Nicholson represented that there was no adequate body of staff officers trained in the work of intelligence, study of country, strategical or tactical dispositions, direction of movements of troops, choice of camps, water, and sanitary matters. I think your Lordships will agree with me and also with these gallant officers that these are matters of the highest importance, and matters that ought not to be left to be learnt after an Army is in the field.

I think it is clear, from what I have read to your Lordships, that more staff officers are required, and that, if given the opportunity, the general body of regimental officers would qualify for the staff. Why not give the opportunity to all those recommended, without competitive examinations, for one year's training in the Staff College, or even six months? There are many staff duties which do not require exceptional ability in languages or strategy. At the end of the year let there be a competitive examination, and retain specially good men for a second year. I will not trouble the House with any arguments as to unlimited service on the staff. It has become a by-word that staff officers once on the staff were always on the staff, notwithstanding the regulation that every officer was to go back to his regiment at the end of his five years term of service. But recently, during the period when Lord Roberts was Commander-in-Chief, I understand a new Order was issued enforcing that regulation, and, I believe, in many cases limiting the staff appointments to a term of three years. This will promote a greater interchange between the staff and regiments to the advantage of both and give more officers the opportunity of staff service and of becoming efficient.

Now, I come to the question of seconding, and to the reply which was given me last year by the noble Earl the then Under-Secretary that it would increase efficiency and discipline but that the cost was too great and the money could be better expended in other ways. I would venture to ask your Lordships in what better way can money be expended than in promoting the discipline and efficiency of our Army? Notwithstanding the *non possumus* attitude taken up by the Under-Secretary last year, events have marched along with very rapid strides, and the position is much altered. A new Order has been issued to the effect that officers joining the Staff College shall be seconded, and that commanding officers of regiments and seconds-in-command shall not go to the staff unless they resign their regimental appointments. Again, I am told that within the last few weeks it has been decided that artillery battery majors in future are to be seconded when employed on the staff; so that the only officers who will now be left unseconded if they serve on the staff will be majors commanding cavalry squadrons. I ask why, when justice has been done to all the other majors, justice should not be done to majors commanding squadrons of cavalry?

There were during the war, and there are even at the present moment, large numbers of captains commanding cavalry squadrons who have never had major's rank or major's pay. At the time when Mr. Childers was Secretary of State for War there was a great change made in the cavalry. Up to that time the troop system had obtained in those regiments, with a captain and two subalterns, whilst the colonel, adjutant, and riding master bossed the show. But Mr. Childers brought about the squadron system. When that system was adopted, it was decided that the squadron should be under a major with a captain and three subalterns, and Mr. Childers considered that the officer commanding a cavalry squadron should have the rank, as he had the responsibilities, of a major. The major of a cavalry squadron is practically the commanding officer of his squadron, with an appeal to the colonel. He is entirely responsible for the pay, drill, mounting, uniform of men, saddlery, discipline, leave of men, and recommendations for promotion, and he is responsible to the colonel and to no one else for the efficiency of his squadron. Therefore, when a squadron major is taken away and placed upon the staff, a captain has to perform all those duties and take all those responsibilities without the rank or the pay of major.

It is a very small question at the present moment, but I would mention that when a major is removed to the staff he gets his pay practically doubled. He has sometimes under £300 a year as a regimental major, but he gets from £600 to £700 a year the moment he goes on the staff. A staff captain receives £500 a year, but the captain who undertakes all the responsibilities of the major when the major is put on the staff only receives the pay he had before. The War Office and the late Commander-in-Chief have done a great deal to promote justice in regard to this matter, and I would ask the authorities, having swallowed the camel, not to strain at the gnat.

I have been careful to look through the number of officers who would be affected at the present moment if justice was done in this matter, and I find that it is only a question of a dozen captains, and the difference of pay, 2s. a day, would only amount to £36 10s. per annum. The sum of £500 would pay the lot and give them major's rank. I do not say that there are not more than a dozen majors on the staff, but the other majors are either students at the Staff College, in colonial employ, or they are majors who have been allowed to continue as adjutants of Yeomanry after they have been promoted, and, therefore, they do not come within the same category. Nor do I include vacancies of those who are seconded, but whose places are not filled. Those I have deducted. I conclude by moving my Resolution and asking the noble Earl the Under-Secretary of State for War whether he can give the House any information with regard to the new Staff College regulations, with regard to the new rule about staff service and whether it is to be enforced, and with regard to the seconding of officers on the staff; and I would express the hope that since justice has been done to the artillery it will not now be withheld from cavalry captains in a like position.

Moved to resolve, "That, in the opinion of this House the present Army Regulations in regard to staff and extra-regimental duties, the non-seconding of officers above the rank of captain in the artillery and cavalry, and the retention of officers in successive appointments on the staff for unlimited periods limits the number of officers duly qualified for staff appointments, are most unfair to regimental officers, and are prejudicial to the best interests of the Army."—(*Lord Heneage.*)

LORD LOVAT: My Lords, I desire to associate myself with the remarks which have fallen from the noble Lord who has just sat down, and, with your Lordships' permission, I would particularly like to point out the great deficiency in the trained staff of our Army as at present constituted. The fact is again brought to our minds that the War Office does not march with the times. Five years ago few, I think, would have suspected the latent power which lay in our Auxiliary Forces and in the untrained patriotic thousands in the country. There is hardly a Minister, to whatever Party he may belong, who, in after dinner speeches, has not congratulated the country on its extraordinary patriotism, but only one Minister has taken any trouble to see that that patriotism, if it is to be called upon again, is directed on proper lines. I refer to Mr. Brodrick. He is the only man who has brought forward a really workable scheme.

We in England have the smallest Regular Army of any European nation, but there is the certainty that if we called upon them we should have probably the largest number of Volunteers which any nation in Europe could produce. Yet we have got no means of working this body into anything which could be called an Army. We are in that position because we have no adequate staff. May I point out the actual number of trained staff officers we have in England at the present time. I am not including those who are already employed, nor those who are at the present moment in service abroad; neither am I including those who are first or second in command of their battalions, because they could not be taken away without seriously interfering with the efficiency of their regiments. In respect to the cavalry we have only two officers who are free, so to speak, to do staff work. We have on paper one cavalry brigade. The second cavalry brigade is on paper, but there are no names below it. Therefore, we should start, if we filled this second cavalry brigade, with a deficiency of cavalry staff officers. Again, when we come to the infantry, we have only seventeen majors and captains who are qualified —that is to say, we have only two officers in the cavalry and seventeen in the infantry who are ready at the present moment to take up staff appointments, and this at a time when we ought to have thoroughly learned the lesson taught by the late war.

The inequality of the staff work in South Africa, as pointed out by many witnesses who gave evidence before Lord Elgin's Commission, arose from the fact that the majority of these officers were taken direct from the regiments without any staff education. We all know that before two divisions had left these islands for South Africa the Staff College men had run out. Messengers were sent to various regiments asking them to supply staff officers, and the officers supplied were sent at once to the front. What happened? The staff work was most inefficient at times of utmost crisis, and the work of the Army throughout was seriously hampered. I would like to point out the hardships which occur in regiments whose officers are taken away in time of war. A regimental commanding officer is ordered to send out a couple of captains or majors for staff work. Naturally he does not send his best men, because he cannot afford to lose them. He sends in all probability the worst officers in the whole of his corps; but when these men return to their regiments, although they are not the best officers and were sent to the staff on that account, they will be for all time above the heads of better men and above the very men who were not sent to the staff because they were better men. That is not justice, and it spoils the work done by the brigade, because the second-class or third-class men sent by the regimental commanding officer for staff work are not up to their duties.

It is a well-known theory, laid down by Moltke and other writers on the subject of military work, that it is essential to have some consecutive pattern of ideas for staff work; but this is quite impossible if you get men in this haphazard manner. Now, with regard to the Auxilary Forces. The Imperial Yeomanry have two majors upon whom they can rely for the whole of their staff work. They had a captain a short time ago, but, unfortunately, he has gone to learn Japanese and has had to be struck off the list; so that at present there are only two staff officers for the whole of the Yeomanry—some 25,000 or 27,000 men. We cannot have our own Yeomanry officers for staff duties because they have not the knowledge. I command a Yeomanry unit, but I should not dream of sending one of my best officers away. It is unreasonable to expect us to do so simply because they do not take care at the War Office to have these things arranged in readiness for mobilisation in time of war.

With regard to the Militia, we know that a large number of the junior officers are merely birds of passage, who only come in for a short time. It would be impossible for a Militia colonel to part with his senior officers. The discipline of the Militia is not such as to enable it to stand much knocking about. We had during the war orders and counter-orders. That may be all right in the case of Regular troops, but Volunteers will not allow themselves to be messed about by men who do not know their work. I certainly think Mr. Brodrick's Army Corps scheme was a good one. It gave us a skeleton on which we could graft our various battalions, and in dropping that scheme we have, in my opinion, gone back. This scheme could only come into force if we had more staff officers. We have not got a sufficient staff, and surely now is the time to remedy that deficiency. Previously when the War Office took men for the Staff College they took them more or less in the dark, and were only able to judge of their capacity as the result of an examination, but here we are at the end of a war. We know who are the good men and who are the bad men; we know who were good staff officers in South Africa and who were bad staff officers. Surely now is the time to get hold of them, and to put them through the Staff College.

Why should we not at the present moment put 100 or 150 officers through the Staff College? They could be given one year's course, as the noble Lord who preceded me suggested, and this large number of trained men would constitute a reserve of staff officers on which you could rely in the event of mobilisation. The argument against this increase of staff officers is one of cost. Could anyone imagine that this cost, if ever we had a war again like we had in South Africa, would not be recovered over and over again if we had efficient staff work? You have only to read the Report of Lord Elgin's Commission to see how money was thrown away broadcast through inefficient staff work in South Africa. I think the extra cost of educating more men at the Staff College ought not to weigh at all in considering this matter. With regard to the argument that there will not be sufficient employment for them, I would say that you want, in the first place, to get your staff in touch with the Auxiliary Forces. The whole question of concentration at a critical point is entirely a matter of the close study of distances, and the time that men will take to travel over distances; and if you have not got a staff capable of calculating this, how can any general be expected to do well or to get his men at critical points at the right time? Therefore, I think that if the principle of extra staff officers is admitted there would be plenty of work for them to do. They could be attached to the infantry and Yeomanry brigades, and would be most valuable in bringing the troops up to a greater state of efficiency.

Of course, a very large proportion of the staff, in case of mobilisation, will have to come from the Auxiliary Forces, but I think it will be admitted that it is absolutely essential that, at all events, a nucleus of a staff, as given by Mr. Brodrick's Army Corps scheme, should be there to point out the lines on which the Auxiliary staff would be able to work. There were at the end of the war three great lines of reform, and I venture to think this one of staff is quite equal to the other two. First of all, there was reform of the War Office, which His Majesty's Government have gone into in no half-hearted manner. Secondly, there was the question of the training of officers, which they have gone into by the appointment of an Education Committee; and, thirdly, they have this great question of the staff. I hope that His Majesty's Government will see their way to obtain a reserve of staff officers, so that if the nation has to fight again and to produce 300,000 men for defence, we shall at all events have some nucleus of a Staff who can be relied upon to educate the staff officers from the Auxiliary Forces who they will have to help them.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The Earl of DONOUGHMORE): My Lords, the noble Lord who initiated this discussion made one general observation with which I should like to deal at once. It was to the effect that the figures produced by my noble friend behind me last year were entirely erroneous. I should have been very interested to know in what particular they were erroneous. I have still those figures. They were, I am sure, most carefully worked out at the War Office at the time, and I have not seen or heard any statement by the noble Lord seriously impugning them. We have a body of trained actuaries at the War Office whose one business it is to make calculations of this kind, and I think that without some very strong proof it is rather a sweeping statement to make to say off-hand that the calculations were inaccurate.

LORD HENEAGE: I took exception to the figures immediately after the noble Earl's speech. A great number of other subjects were brought in to make up the amounts which had nothing whatever to do with the pay of cavalry majors.

*THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: I have read last year's debates carefully, and the impression I got was that the noble Lord did not make it clear on the first occasion that he was not considering the case of all majors.

LORD HENEAGE: My Question was on the Paper, and it distinctly stated that I was only dealing with cavalry and artillery majors.

*THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: I am quite prepared to accept that. The figures given by my noble friend Lord Hardwicke did include the infantry and my noble friend opposite did not, I think, say anything at that time which would convey the impression that he meant to exclude the infantry. But he did say a few days afterwards that that was his intention, and my noble friend then corrected the figures he gave on the first occasion. The noble Lord, in raising this question to-night, suggested a scheme by which we should take a larger number of men into the Staff College for one year and a smaller number for the two years course. I admit at once that that is a very alluring proposal; but the difficulty in the way is a practical one. The course at the Staff College is very carefully thought out, and that for the first year is very different from the course in the second. It is a different style of thing altogether. The first year's course deals with military history, artillery, and fortification, staff duties, military administration, and other subjects. The second year's course goes into bigger questions, what I might call general staff questions—questions of Imperial defence, practice in reconnaissance, practice in training of troops, and tours of inspection—and it is quite impossible to tell at the end of the first year whether a man will be any use at the things he is going to study in the second year until after he has entered on the second year's course. It would make things very much easier to pass a larger number of men through the one year course and a smaller number through the full two years; but I am afraid the system would not benefit the Army in the end, and we might lose the services of many men who might not be so good at the work in the first year, but who might turn out useful staff officers in general staff work.

I am entirely at one with the two noble Lords who have spoken as to the necessity of more staff officers for the Army; and I am glad to see that they recognise that the Staff College training is absolutely necessary in order to turn out efficient staff officers. The output of staff officers at the present moment is not anything like large enough for our requirements. Our requirements are growing every day. It is not quite germane to the subject, but it may interest your Lordships to know that in the organisation of the General Staff at the War Office we intend to employ sixty-five officers to do the work that has hitherto been done by thirty-two. That at once creates a large number of staff appointments of very great importance, for which we have got to find the very best candidates. In the Intelligence Branch, which is now under the Director of Military Operations, and in which we have hitherto employed twenty-seven officers, we shall find plenty of work for forty-three, and the remainder will be employed in the other branches of the department performing work for which only a very small staff has hitherto existed. This fact alone has vastly added to the necessity for turning out more staff officers, and we are fully alive to the fact that we have to meet these necessities.

Lord Tweedmouth made some strong remarks the other day as to the Government's unsettled convictions in this matter. He said that we were unable to make up our minds as to the reforms recommended by the Esher Committee. The noble Lord displayed an innocence of knowlege which did him infinite credit, but I think the statement I have made will convince him that we are not moving so slowly as the outside world seems to imagine, because we do not always talk about what we are doing. With regard to the suggestion that we should enlarge nomination and pass a great many more men through the Staff College, I would point out that our experience is against too great an extension of the system of nomination. The late Commandant at the Staff College has said that when a limited number of officers were selected by nomination it was frequently found that amongst them were some of the best officers of the College, but that when a large number were selected it resulted in the whole falling below the normal. We are fully alive to the need for further staff officers, and the matter is being most seriously considered. Your Lordships have no doubt read the recent Army Order issued by Lord Kitchener. You will see that Lord Kitchener is contemplating the establishment of a Staff College in India; this matter is now the subject of discussion between the War Office and the India Office, and I hope a decision will be come to at an early date.

Now I come to the second point raised by Lord Heneage, as to the non-seconding of officers above the rank of captain in the artillery and cavalry. The noble Lord does not include the infantry, and, therefore, I will say nothing about them beyond stating that the case for the non-inclusion of the infantry is very strong. It has been decided that artillery majors extra-regimentally employed are to be seconded, that is to say, they are to be succeeded in their appointments by majors. The first objection of the noble Lord's therefore falls to the ground. The noble Lord's point I think is that an artillery major commands a unit — a battery — and therefore ought to be seconded on going to the staff, and that a cavalry major commands a unit—a squadron—and ought therefore to be also seconded. I should like to say first that it would be much more difficult to work in the cavalry with small regiments than in the artillery where there are a lot of officers. There are 1,100 officers in the the Horse and Field Artillery, and 900 in the Garrison Artillery. We cannot recognise that a squadron is exactly the same unit as a battery. The squadron is a third of the cavalry regiment, and the regiment is commanded by a colonel who has authority over the majors, which does not exist in the case of the artillery.

It is true, as the noble Lord has said, that since 1887 the major commands the squadron, and that since that year his authority as squadron commander has been to a certain extent increased. In 1897, however, we added sixteen majors to the cavalry, with the result that promotion already in the cavalry is faster than it is in any other branch, and any alteration in the direction which the noble Lord suggested might very reasonably be argued to be unfair to the officers in other branches of the service. I now come to a point on which I really do lay stress. It is this, that we do now want the squadron majors away from their regiments and on the staff. We recognise that they are approaching the time when they will have to command the regiment, and we do not wish to encourage them to go away on the staff during those years. We want them to remain and get fully in touch with their regiments preparatory to assuming command a few years later. That is our great objection to seconding. There is a contention at the back of this that it is unfair that while the major is away the captain should do his work and not get full major's rank and pay.

Lord HENEAGE: That is my whole point.

*The Earl of DONOUGHMORE: My first answer to that is that we do all we can to prevent the majors going away, and the second is that though, in some cases, it may cause hardship, it is not an unknown thing in other walks of life for men to do the work of a higher post while occupying the lower one. Officers are glad of the opportunity of showing that they are capable of doing the higher work, and at the same time they gain experience which is bound to be of use to them in their future career. I do not wish to pretend that that entirely does away with any hardship, but, if I may use the expression, it materially gilds the pill. In conclusion, I would only repeat that the reason we cannot meet the noble Lord on this point is that we do claim that the main cavalry unit is the regiment and not the squadron.

I entirely agree with the noble Lord that after a period of staff service the officers should return to their regiments. There is an unwritten law at the War Office to this effect, and I have made careful inquiries and find that it is strictly enforced. There have, however, been exceptions during the last few years, but they were cases in which it was to the advantage of the Army that exceptions should be made; and although exceptions are always unpleasant things, we must have a free hand sometimes to dispense with rules. I can assure the noble Lord that there are no two opinions at the War Office that this rule ought to be enforced in every case where it is possible. I hope I have shown that in the main I am not antagonistic to the noble Lord, and I trust that in the circumstances he will not find it necessary to press his Motion to a division.

LORD HENEAGE: My Lords, I shall be very glad to withdraw my Motion after what I think is a very satisfactory explanation given by the noble Earl. I do not wish to say anything more with regard to the erroneous figures than that a lot of other calculations connected with the infantry were brought in last year by the noble Earl which largely increased the amount. With regard to the seconding of cavalry officers, I did not base my argument entirely on the question of a cavalry squadron being a unit. I do not see why cavalry majors should be the only majors in the whole service who are not seconded when they go away for staff work.

LORD TWEEDMOUTH: My Lords, I do not intend to rise to the fly thrown by the noble Earl the Under-Secretary and to state my opinions as to the convictions, settled or otherwise, of His Majesty's Government. But, plausible as the speech of the noble Earl was, he entirely failed to touch upon the most important point raised by the noble and gallant Lord behind me, Lord Lovat. My noble friend pointed out, I thought with great force, that from the fact of our having been at war for three years the War Office had attained very good and complete knowledge of the relative merits of the men who served on the staff throughout that long campaign—a campaign that involved the employment of a large number of men on the staff and a continual shifting of those men. The point my noble and gallant friend urged was this, that having got this information the War Office should make use of it, and not allow to drop back into obscurity those men who had proved themselves good staff officers Whatever arrangements may be made for securing a sufficient supply of men to serve in His Majesty's Army, we are obliged to keep ready a set of officers capable of taking charge of the men who come forward; and it does seem to me that we have a right to ask from His Majesty's Government some more definite answer than the Under-Secretary has given on the points raised by Lord Lovat. Most people who take any interest in the fortunes of the British Army recognise that a good supply of the very best class of officers, instructed in the latest methods of warfare, brought up to the highest state of efficiency, is one of the most pressing needs of the country. I hope His Majesty's Government will take note of my noble and gallant friend's speech, and may even now tell us they have ready at hand, some scheme for dealing with his suggestions.

Motion, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

NAVAL INTERPRETERS.

*__LORD ELLENBOROUGH__: My Lords, I rise to call the attention of the House to the fact that, according to the June Navy List, out of 123 naval interpreters only two officers on the executive list have passed in Russian, that the only executive officer who has passed in

German is on the Reserve List, that no officer of any branch of the Naval Service has passed in Japanese; and to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if he will consider the advisability of giving a certain number of selected officers further facilities and inducements for the study of the German, Russian, and Japanese languages; also to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty how many of the 123 officers who have passed as interpreters, and how many of the eighteen executive officers who have passed as French interpreters, are in receipt of the extra allowances payable to naval interpreters.

According to the June Navy List there are 123 officers in different branches of the service who have passed as interpreters in various languages. Sixteen of these have passed in German, and eight in Russian. But although fifty-five have passed in Oriental languages, not a single officer of any branch of the service has yet passed in Japanese. But what is still more extraordinary is that not one of the sixteen officers who have passed in German is on the regular executive list. Lieutenant Simpson-Baikie, who has passed in that language, is an officer in the Merchant Service and is on the list of the Royal Navy Reserve. Thirty-seven officers have passed in French, of whom eighteen are on the executive list. Surely the French Navy is not eighteen times as important as the German? From the little that I know about the latter service, I consider that its methods are worthy of the most careful study. Yet such studies can scarcely be undertaken except by those who, in addition to a knowledge of the language, are well acquainted with technical details, with the manœuvres of fleets, and who have done duty on the bridge. If we were acting in alliance with the German Navy we should not be able to derive the full benefit of such an alliance, as more than a usual number of misunderstandings would take place.

I am, however, glad to see that eight Marine officers, one Engineer officer, and six officers of other branches of the service have passed in German. Executive officers have less leisure than those in other branches, are more likely to be disturbed at odd hours, and have had in consequence fewer opportunities. Of the eight officers who passed in Russian, only two—Commander Kemp and Lieutenant Duncan—are on the active list of executive officers. Naval men have not neglected the Oriental languages, for I find that eight have passed in Persian, nine in Arabic, twenty-eight in Hindostani, twenty-four in Swahili, and two in Chinese. Yet no officer of any branch of the service has passed in Japanese, though one has passed in Chinook. I heartily congratulate the noble Earl on the addition he has lately made to the number of officers employed in the Intelligence Department, and though I have no doubt that that department is carefully studying the war in the East, still I consider that this ignorance of the languages of naval Powers of importance may be the cause of mistaken expenditure in time of peace, and a source of danger to the State in time of war.

Every naval officer is now studying the Russo-Japanese War. To do this thoroughly he must have translations before him. The ordinary civilian writer will not help him much. The translator must have technical as well as literary knowledge. The tactical arrangements of the Japanese, the means they have adopted to protect their convoys, how they make use of the secondary and improvised bases, such as the Elliott Islands, and how they repair most of their ships without sending them back to Japan, should be thoroughly studied by officers acquainted with their language. The systems used on both sides as regards telegraphy, wireless or otherwise, the methods of laying down and removing anchored explosives, of blocking and clearing the entrances of harbours, the details of the fittings of turrets and gun-carriages, the sighting of guns both for day and night firing, the plans adopted for torpedo attack and defence, and how far original fittings have had to be discarded or altered under the stress of actual warfare, are also well worthy of attention. I am aware that a large number of both Russian and Japanese officers are acquainted with our language, but that is not quite the same thing as our officers knowing theirs. We require officers with technical knowledge, able to translate whatever either side may publish. At the close of the war we may expect to find that a great deal of literature is available if we are prepared to take advantage of it. Unsuccessful or superseded officers will find some means of defending themselves, even in countries where the Press is muzzled.

At the close of the Franco-German conflict a large number of our military officers undertook the study of French and German for the sole purpose of being able to master the details of that struggle. Until the conditions of war had been altered by improvements in the weapons, I do not think that they could have employed their time better. While the Russians and Japanese are fighting, some of our executive officers ought to be studying their languages, so as to be able to take advantage of their experience directly the war is over. In the next great struggle for the supremacy of the seas, our success or failure may depend upon our having rightly read the lessons of the Russo-Japanese War.

I will give your Lordships an instance of the foresight of the Japanese themselves, as regards this very question of learning languages. In 1858 Lord Elgin made a treaty with Japan, and several ports were it consequence opened to the British. In 1859 I was on board the ship that brought the British Consul to Hakodadi. To our astonishment, shortly after we had anchored, a letter, written in English by the Governor of Hakodadi, was handed to our captain. It was on foolscap, in exact conformity with our Admiralty rules and regulations for correspondence, but written with a paint brush instead of a pen. There were only two slight mistakes in it, which might have escaped notice had it not been carefully examined. The Governor of Hakodadi had been told off to learn English because his harbour was about to become a treaty port, and I hope that the noble Earl at the head of the Admiralty will at once tell off a few of our executive officers to learn German, Russian, and Japanese.

I am not at all an advocate of making languages compulsory throughout the whole of the service. Some officers have a facility for learning languages, others have not. The latter will be better employed in learning something else. But when a man has learnt another language besides his own he learns a second foreign language with much greater facility. On Monday last an excellent circular was issued by the Admiralty which goes far towards meeting the necessities of the case. It greatly increases both the facilities and the inducements for learning foreign languages. For instance, the number of officers who are to be allowed to study languages while on full pay is to be increased from ten to twenty. I think that that number may be a normal one. But we have great arrears to make up, and as the necessity for a proper study of the Russian and Japanese languages is immediate, I would suggest to the noble Earl that it would be desirable that executive officers studying the German, Russian, and Japanese languages should be considered as additional to the limit of twenty, until at least twelve of them have passed in each language. We ought to have a minimum of interpreters in certain tongues.

I hope the Treasury will not object to the slight additional expense that will be incurred if my suggestion is adopted. Taking the difference between full and half pay at an average of 8s. a day for the various ranks, the extra charge for thirty-four officers would amount to less than £5,000 a year, for one year only. I put the number at thirty-four, because we have already two executive officers who have passed in Russian. It is false economy to employ an insufficient number of officers to criticise this war. Next year millions will be spent on the Navy. Whether they are rightly or wrongly spent depends entirely as to whether we shall have learnt aright the lessons to be derived from it or not. The £5,000 that I ask for is a trifle as compared with the expense of our autumn manœuvres, and there is far more to be learnt from a real war than from any manœuvres. During manœuvres the complaint is constantly made that in a real war the result would have been different. But when a ship is put out of action by being sunk in battle, there is no use in complaining of the rules, or of the stupidity or partiality of an umpire. There is no getting over the fact that she has been put out of action in accordance with the stern realities of war.

There is another point in the circular to which I wish to draw attention. I regret to see that technical terms do not form part of the lower standard for Japanese. In the higher standard it is stated that some acquaintance with terms used in the naval service will be required. I have great doubts if one year is sufficient to allow for the study of Japanese. But if the Admiralty set twelve officers to commence their studies at once we shall be more certain about that in twelve months time. The candidate should certainly be made to translate a few pages from a gunnery book, and from text books on steam and torpedoes. Exact knowledge of the construction of sentences in Russian and Japanese classical works may be safely left to the gentlemen of the Foreign Office, who have to interpret treaties and protocols, and who are not expected to be naval interpreters. The exact construction of a gun or of a torpedo is of more importance to naval officers than the construction of a complicated sentence.

I have the liveliest recollection of the first time that I ever acted as a naval interpreter. I was a naval cadet on board one of our three-deckers which touched at Brest for coal when on her way back from the Crimea. The master —that is, the navigating officer—told me to tell the French officer in charge of the moorings that he was going to get a hauling-line out of the starboard hawse-hole so as to be able to bouse in the bight of his cable. I know that many of your Lordships are well acquainted with the French language, but I doubt if even the noble Marquess at the head of the Foreign Office would be able to translate such a sentence at short notice. Ten years later I passed in French as naval interpreter. Had our parts been reversed I should certainly have rejected my examiner. He was a French Professor utterly ignorant of any technical terms. The question arises in my mind as to how far the Civil Service Commissioners are competent to examine officers in nautical terms. The term "maritime idiom" which appears in the circular is very vague. It appears in a former circular, in which 100 marks out of 1,200 are assigned to it, but I have no recollection of seeing it in any other document. It has been supposed by some persons to include words that are unfortunately still occasionally made use of by some nautical men when suffering from impatience. Whether this be so or not, I should suggest that in future out of the 1,200 numbers mentioned in the circular seventy-five numbers should be given for nautical terms, seventy-five for words used in steam, and seventy-five for words used in gunnery and torpedo work; and I further think that the Civil Service Commissioners would do well to call in nautical experts to assist them at these examinations. I have alluded to these matters because I am afraid that if the literary and grammatical standards are placed too high, officers may be deterred from studying these languages.

What I suggest to the First Lord is that, while retaining a high technical standard, he should lower the literary standard required for Russian and Japanese interpreterships, and that he should give even more special facilities for the study of those languages, until we have at least twelve executive officers who have passed in each of them. The second part of my Question has been put because, hitherto, officers who have qualified as interpreters have been much discouraged by not receiving the pay that they considered to be due to them, on the plea that they had not been specially appointed as interpreters. But as the schedule attached to this circular says that—

"Interpreters will be appointed to flagships,"

and that an interpreter in French and German will be allowed in each ship carrying midshipmen, I hope that in future that grievance may be considered remedied.

I heartily congratulate the noble Earl on his recent circular, which is, I think, well calculated to deal with the normal state of the Navy, when the arrears that I have referred to have been worked up. But I hope that he will ask the Treasury for that extra £5,000 and that he will at once appoint a number of officers to study the three languages I have referred to. It is a matter that might well be brought before the Committee for National Defence. I shall conclude by asking a favour of the First Lord of the Admiralty. When a person is suddenly surprised by being asked to do something unexpected and to pay some money, his first impulse is to say, no. I would therefore ask the noble Earl not to give a definite reply to my request for £5,000 and thirty-six interpreters at present, especially as I have given him no notice of it, but to think it over with his colleagues, and to consider the subject as an open one at present. I now put the Question that stands in my name.

VISCOUNT SIDMOUTH: My Lords, before the First Lord of the Admiralty answers the Questions which have been put to him by the noble Lord who has just sat down, I should like to say a few words with regard to the difficulty which may exist in removing officers for a considerable time from their proper work. I am quite certain that no man can thoroughly acquire languages, especially those very difficult languages to which the noble Lord has referred, without sojourning abroad. He must mix with the natives of those countries before he can acquire the language in a conversational form; and what I wish to ask the noble Earl the First Lord is, whether he will consider the necessity of giving officers facilities for studying abroad, at the same time allowing them to retain their former position in the Service? By that I mean that no man should lose anything in consequence of his having remained abroad; he should not lose his chance, for instance, of commanding a ship because he had spent the requisite time abroad to make himself proficient in a particular language.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (The Earl of SELBORNE): My Lords, I am obliged to the noble Lord who brought this question forward for his kind words about myself, and I am very glad to be able to say what I think will not surprise your Lordships, that I agree with almost every word he has uttered. I do not pin myself to adhesion to exactly every detailed proposal he has made, but to the general spirit of his remarks I cordially adhere. This question of foreign languages has undoubtedly been sadly neglected in the Navy, and it is, I think, essential that there should be an adequate staff of officers of the executive as well as of the other branches who can speak all the important languages of the world if the Navy is in all respects to be equipped for its work in war and the study of its profession in peace. I can assure the noble Lord that the war now in progress is being most deeply studied by the Admiralty, both here and on the spot so far as the opportunities present themselves; and he will, I think, be glad to know that the first officers, in both cases a captain, attached to the Japanese and the Russian Fleets were both able to speak the language of the nation to which they were attached.

Although the number of officers in the Navy List who speak certain languages is meagre as analysed by the noble Lord, and although I agree with him that the general linguistic attainments of the Navy fall far short of what we desire, yet there are, as a matter of fact, a considerable number of officers who do speak foreign languages but who are not registered in the Navy List because they have never thought fit to endeavour to register themselves as interpreters.

LORD ELLENBOROUGH: They are afraid of the high literary standard, I expect.

THE EARL OF SELBORNE: Not necessarily, I think. The officer who is at present attached to the Russian Fleet in the Far East is a captain who had spent a considerable time in Russia, and he speaks Russian, I believe, excellently, but he had never, for some reason I do not understand, registered himself as a qualified interpreter. The circular letter of the Admiralty to which the noble Lord has referred was issued last Monday, and therefore it is much too soon to say what its effect will be. The Board of Admiralty will naturally watch its working very carefuly, and I do not for a moment put it forward as our last word on the subject. If experience shows that changes in the regulations are necessary, and that the movement is not progressing fast enough, we shall be quite ready to endeavour to improve our machinery. The number of officers on the list of interpreters in the June Navy List is not 123, as quoted by the noble Lord, but 122—a correction of no importance; but of this number only twelve are appointed at the present moment as interpreters. Two of these are executive officers, and of them, one is an interpreter in French. Allowances are payable in the case of each officer appointed as interpreter to a ship.

That is the state of things which we find in existence. It is not the state of things which we hope will exist when the new regulations have been working for a year or two. In the last few years there has been such a dearth of lieutenants, owing to the expansion of the Fleet, that there really has been no possibility of giving them leave to study languages on the Continent. But the list is now so rapidly increasing that I hope we shall shortly have a margin. Perhaps those noble lords who have not seen the circular will allow me very briefly to recapitulate the principal points with which we have endeavoured to deal and to comment a little upon them. In the first place, the number of officers who are to be allowed to study abroad at any one time is increased to twenty; that does not mean twenty in the year, but that every day in the year there may be twenty officers studying abroad—a very different thing. They will be on full pay the whole time, and it will count as "service."

The full pay will also be granted without any condition as to subsequent qualification; that is to say, an officer will not go with the dread before him that he may fail in his examination and have to refund half his full pay. Whether he succeeds or fails he will get his full pay for the period he is studying abroad. The period during which study abroad on full pay will be allowed is regulated according to the language which the officer is studying. The reward of the successful officer is to take the form of a gratuity according to a scale, a distinction being drawn between officers who qualify in the higher standard and those who qualify in the lower standard. In the next place, the allowances to officers appointed hereafter as interpreters will be regulated according to the language or qualification. Officers on the list of interpreters will be required to requalify every five years, and for this purpose they will be allowed to go abroad to the country speaking the language in which they are qualified on one month's full pay, in order to prepare themselves for requalification. Again, officers who are qualified to give instruction in foreign languages to junior officers on board His Majesty's ships will receive 5s. for each lesson of one hour's duration, the number of lessons for which payment will be made being limited to four a week. That, of course, is in addition to their pay as interpreters.

The prizes to midshipmen who attain proficiency have been increased to the annual value of £130. That is, of course, with the object of encouraging midshipmen to keep up the language they may have learnt previous to entering the service, so that they may start with some knowledge when they go abroad to qualify as interpreters. With regard to the study of foreign languages at the new Royal Naval College at Osborne, I believe we shall do more there in respect of French and German than could be done through these regulations, or through any efforts made by officers at a later period of their career to learn French and German abroad. This is, perhaps, a rash thing to say in your Lordships' House, where the experience of public schools is so universal, but I do thoroughly believe that we are going to succeed at Osborne where the public schools have so notably failed. We are going to teach the boys French or German, or both, in a way which will enable them to make themselves understood in France or Germany, and to understand what Frenchmen and Germans say to them, and be competent to study any literature in those languages.

As regards Japanese, the arrangements in respect to that are quite special. In addition to the institution of a special scale in connection with the study of Japanese, we are going to appoint a Japanese teacher at Wei-hai-Wei. In normal times the China Fleet is constantly using Wei-hai-Wei as headquarters for months together, and a Japanese instructor will be stationed there, who will be at the service of any officers of the Fleet. Officers who are now holding appointments as interpreters or acting-interpreters under the old regulations will be allowed to retain their appointments until the expiration of the commission of the ship in which they are serving, and an interpreter qualified in French or German will be allowed to each ship which carries midshipmen. Candidates for these interpreterships will have the opportunity of being examined by the Civil Service Commissioners three times a year, in April, July, and October, and I think the noble Lord need not be anxious lest the Civil Service Commissioners should be incompetent to examine these officers in technical naval phraseology. After all, it is not a subject with which we are altogether unfamiliar. There is drawn up for the instruction of cadets on the "Britannia" as perfect a comparative table of French and English terminology as exists in the whole world, and what has been done in the case of French could be done in the case of other languages. At any rate, I can assure my noble friend that the importance of the special terminology will not be forgotten.

In this examination a thorough knowledge of the language selected by the candidates will be required, and he will be examined orally as well as by written papers. I do not think the noble Lord need be afraid lest the examination should degenerate into one purely of grammar. Of course, it is desired that these officers should have a real grasp of the language they are acquiring in every respect, but the main point to be aimed at is that the language should be an instrument which the officer can use from day to day in his rough service as a naval officer, and, therefore, that he should be able to understand it when it is spoken, and to speak it fluently, is of the utmost importance.

Perhaps your Lordships will allow me to quote the scale which has been drawn up. In respect of Japanese, an officer will be allowed to reside in Japan for twelve months on full pay for the higher standard, or six months for the lower, and, if he succeeds, he will receive a gratuity of £200 for the higher standard, or £100 for the lower standard, and his pay as interpreter will be 2s. 6d. per diem. In the case of Russian, the duration of residence abroad will be nine months for the higher stipend and six months for the lower; the gratuity on qualifying will be £150 and £75 respectively, and the additional pay whilst employed as interpreter, 2s. 6d. per diem. In the case of German, Dutch, and modern Greek, the duration of residence abroad will be six months for the higher standard and four months for the lower; the gratuity on qualifying, £70 and £35 respectively, and the additional pay whilst employed as interpreter, 2s. per diem. In the case of French, Italian, Spanish, and Portugese, the duration of residence abroad will be four months for the higher standard and three months for the lower; the gratuity on qualifying £50 and £25 respectively, and the additional pay whilst employed 1s.6d. per diem.

Noble Lords may think the period of four months in France very low, but it must, of course, be remembered that it is not expected that any officer will go to France with a complete ignorance of the language. The officers who will go are those who already have some knowledge of it, and when the cadets trained at Osborne are in the service they will be lieutenants who will really have had adequate instruction in the language already. I have only, in conclusion, to ask your Lordships to allow me to read the two concluding paragraphs of the circular, because they indicate exactly the point of view from which the Admiralty has studied this question—

> "In revising the regulations in the manner indicated my Lords have been influenced by a strong sense of the disadvantages attending the want of familiarity with foreign languages shown by officers of His Majesty's Navy, and of the importance of promoting among them a knowledge of the languages spoken by officers of foreign fleets, with whom friendly intercourse is of frequent occurrence. Their Lordships accordingly desire that these regulations may be made known generally in the Fleet, and it is their wish that officers should be encouraged to volunteer for study abroad in accordance with the provisions of the regulations.
>
> "It is further their Lordships hope that as the number of officers qualified to instruct in foreign languages increases, greater opportunities will be afforded to midshipmen to study foreign languages, especially French and German, while serving afloat. Advantage is to be taken, whenever possible, of the presence of a qualified instructor to form classes on board ship for this purpose."

The object for which naval officers should study foreign languages is not only to enable them to converse with the officers of those fleets when they meet them, but to enable them to study the naval literature and the literature generally of those countries; because, great as is, I hope, the field of study which the British Navy offers to the other navies of the world, I am quite sure there is not a single navy from which we cannot learn something ourselves if we study it adequately, and it is in that spirit that I believe and trust the officers of the Navy will approach all naval literature emanating from rival navies.

THE DE MORLEY BARONY.

*LORD HAWKESBURY: My Lords, I rise to ask the Lord Chancellor whether his attention has been called to the fact reported in the newspaper that the Judge of the City of London Court stated in Court that a suitor in that Court, a gentleman styling himself Lord de Morley, was a Peer of the Realm; and whether it was not the fact that the gentleman in question, who claims to be an heir or co-heir of that barony, has never had his claim considered by the Committee of Privileges, and therefore can have no cl im to be designated a Peer. I should, perhaps, state that the barony is quite a different one from that in respect of which my noble friend Lord De Mauley sits in this House, and the title is spelt in a different way. I may say that I have no wish to criticise the claim of this gentleman to the title, which may, or may not, prove to be a good one when it comes to be considered by the Committee of Privileges, but it does seem to me that a statement made by a Judge in Court in this manner is very likely to be misconstrued by persons who are not conversant with the practice of the Committee of Privileges and of your Lordships' House, for they may attach to it a weight and authority it does not possess, and it is for that reason, and knowing how rightly jealous your Lordships are of the dignity and privileges of this House, that I have ventured to call attention to this matter.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of HALSBURY): My Lords, I am sorry that I have not been able to verify the exact quotation from the learned Judge, chiefly because I suspect that he must have been misunderstood or misreported. It is probable that the learned Judge was endeavouring to disclaim, on the part of this gentleman, with whom he seemed to be acquainted, that he was a mere impostor, the phrase used apparently being that the gentleman was "by no means a bogus Peer." The Judge was evidently endeavouring to say that the gentleman was not claiming to be what he had no right to claim, but that he was a perfectly respectable gentleman. I believe that to be true; I know nothing against the gentleman. He appeared before me when I was presiding over the Court of Claims, and claimed to be a Peer, and I informed him that he must prove his case before the proper tribunal. No one can entertain any doubt as to the impropriety of a Judge, or anybody else, pronouncing judgment upon a matter which has not been heard, and which can only be heard by your Lordships' House. I think it extremely improbable, however, that the learned Judge actually used the words attributed to him, and that the misapprehension was due to an error in the report.

House adjourned at twenty minutes past Six o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 8th July, 1904.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).

MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—Ilford Urban District Council Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz.:—De Trafford Estate Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

Great Central Railway Bill; London County Council (Money) Bill; Plymouth Corporation Bill; Wolverhampton Corporation Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Filey Improvement Bill [Lords]; Maidenhead Bridge Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Ebbw Vale Urban District Water Bill [Lords]; Harrogate Waterworks Tramroad Bill [Lords]; Richard Jaeger's Patent Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Airdrie Corporation Gas Order Confirmation Bill [Lords]; Wishaw Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

Arbroath Corporation Water Order Confirmation Bill; Dunfermline District Water Order Confirmation Bill. Considered; to be read the third time upon Monday next.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill. As amended, considered; to be read the third time upon Monday next.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill (by Order). As amended, considered; to be read the third time upon Monday next.

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP No. 10).

Sir LEWIS McIVER reported from the Committee on Group No. 10 of Railway Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, they had adjourned until Tuesday next, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Soothill Nether Urban District Tramways Bill; Doncaster Corporation Bill; Skipton Water and Improvement Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to— Minehead Urban District Council Water Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend the Merchant Shipping Acts, 1894 to 1900." [Merchant Shipping Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, relating to Bath Rural District, Brynmawr, Chippenham, Eastleigh and Bishopstoke, Hanwell, Southgate Urban District, Tamworth, Walton-le-Dale, Watford, and Widnes (Amendment)." [Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, relating to Ashford (Kent), Ely, Ham, Hexham, Horley, Keynsham (Somerset), Kingswood, Newton Abbot (Extension), Teignmouth (Amendment), and Walton-upon-Thames." Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade, under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, relating to Clevedon, Portishead and Long Ashton, Crediton, Devizes, Hampton Wick and District, Houghton-le-Spring and District, the Maldens and Coombe, Northampton and District, Stroud, Nailsworth, and Dursley and Trowbridge (Urban), Bradford-on-Avon (Urban), and Bradford-on Avon (Rural)." [Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade, under The Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, relating to Bognor Gas, Elham Valley Gas, Elstree and Boreham Wood Gas, Finedon Gas, and Godalming Gas." [Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [Lords].

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under The Gas and Waterworks Facilities Act, 1870, relating to Rainham Water, Sevenoaks Water, Southwold Water, Wetherby District Water, and Meldreth and Melbourn District Gas and Water." [Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords].

Strabane, Raphoe, and Convoy Railway Bill. That they request that this House will be pleased to give leave to the right hon. George Wyndham, Chief Secretary for Ireland, a Member of this House, to attend, in order to his being examined as a Witness before the Select Committee appointed by their Lordships in the present Session of Parliament on the Stabane, Raphoe, and Convoy Railway Bill.

Lords Message, requesting the attendance of the right hon. George Wyndham, considered :—

And, Mr. Wyndham, in his place, having consented, leave given.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 260.]

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 261.]

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 262.]

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 263.]

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 264.]

PETITIONS.

ALKALI WORKS, ETC., BILL.

Petition from Glasgow, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; from Alston; Alvaston; Bentham; Bridgwater; Bristol (two); Burnley; Copmanthorpe; Creetland; Dairycoates; Denton; Dumfries; Eaton; Edenfield; Edinburgh; Exmouth; Fenton; Frisby; Garndiffaith; Garrigill; Gatehouse on Fleet; Great Dalby; Hadfield; Halton; Hornsey; Hull; Hungarton; Huntingdon; Isle of Wight; Lambeth; Lincoln (two); Linlithgow; Littletown; Llanidloes; Long Clawson; Marston; Merthyr Tydvil; Morpeth; Nenthead; Newcastle on Tyne; Ocker Hill; Oldbury; Oldham; Partick (two); Pendleton; Ponteband; Pontnewynydd; Rhyl (three); Rotherhithe; Seaford; Seaton Delaval; Sewstern; Sheffield (two); Sidmouth; Sowood; Sproxton; Stainland; Stockton on Tees; Teesdale; Thornaby on Tees; Thrussington; Waterhouses (two); West Vale; Wingate; and Wysall; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petition from Brighton, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

TELEGRAPH (CONSTRUCTION) BILL.

Petition from Essex, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

VALUATION BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from East Ashford; and Saddleworth; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

CRIMINAL AND JUDICIAL STATISTICS (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Criminal and Judicial Statistics of Ireland for the year 1903. Part II. Civil Statistics [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).

Copy presented, of Colonial Report, No. 388 (Wei-hai-Wei), Annual Report for 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

IRON AND STEEL, 1901.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 6th July; *Mr. Gerald Balfour*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 244.]

HUMANE SLAUGHTERING OF ANIMALS.

Copy presented, of Report of the Committee appointed by the Admiralty to consider the Humane Slaughtering of Animals, together with Minutes of Evidence, Appendices, and Index [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ALLOTMENTS (SCOTLAND).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 16th May; *Mr. Eugene Watson*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 245.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Use of Site of English Cemetery at Corfu.

SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether a casino has been built on ground formerly part of the old English cemetery at Corfu, and whether gambling will be allowed in such casino; whether the old cemetery consisted of a piece of land 350 yards by 120 yards, and that this land has been conceded to the Greek Government in exchange for a piece of land ninety yards by sixty yards; and, if so, what were the reasons for this exchange.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) The old British cemetery is being laid out as a garden, and no casino will be built on the site. Gambling is forbidden by Greek law. The main reason for ceding the old cemetery was that it occupied a very central position, and was a serious obstacle to the extension and embellishment of the town of Corfu. The area of the old cemetery is approximately 197 by sixty-seven yards. A space of some 100 by thirteen yards has been provided in the new cemetery for the re-interment of the remains transferred from the old. A further space of about eighty-two by eighty-two yards is available for future British burials, and in addition a strip of land amounting to 750 square yards has been ceded by the municipality in case further space is required. It is estimated that the new cemetery is of sufficient extent to provide for all interments for nearly a century to come.

Position of Post Office at Kilrea, County Antrim.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast S.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether, in view of the fact that the post office in Kilrea, county Antrim, is now vacant, he will consider the public convenience of placing it in a more central position than has hitherto been the case.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) In making a new appointment to the sub-post office at Kilrea, I will see that due consideration is given to the situation of the office.

Qualifications for Post Office Engineering Department.

MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether the recent alterations in the examinations for the position of second-class engineer were under consideration by the Department at the time the official witnesses gave evidence before the Bradford Commission; whether, in view of his declaration that telegraphists are not excluded from competition, he will state what steps the Department intend taking to give opportunities for operating telegraphists in their employ to undergo two years training in a suitable workshop attached to a college or University; and will he explain the reason for the reduction of the age limit, seeing that heretofore practical experience in the telegraph service has been considered of great advantage to the engineering department.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) The scheme for throwing open to competition a certain proportion of the vacancies for second-class engineers was under consideration at the time referred to. There is nothing in the evidence given before the

Wages Committee which is inconsistent with that scheme. The condition that candidates must have undergone at least two years training in a suitable workshop attached to a college or University, or under a firm of electrical or mechanical engineers, applies to candidates for those vacancies which will be filled by open competition. Officers already in the service will be eligible for promotion to the much larger number of vacancies which will be filled as before, and in this case the requirement of two years training does not apply. The limits of age, recently fixed, apply to open competition candidates only.

Volunteers in the Postal Telegraph Service—Leave to Attend Annual Inspection.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): To ask the Postmaster - General whether he will explain why the arrangements made by the authorities at the Central Telegraph Office, London, for the purpose of permitting Volunteers employed in that department to attend annual regimental inspections have been altered this year; and whether he will direct that the practice of last year shall be reverted to.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) The rule is that all Volunteers on duty at the time of the inspection should be relieved and substitutes found for them by the department. No alteration has been made in the rule this year. I find, however, that some men have applied for much longer leave than is necessary to enable them to attend the inspection, and this, of course, cannot be granted.

Erection of Small Arms Factory in India.

MR. BELL (Derby): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether in view of the fact that a factory for small arms has been erected, or is in course of erection, in India, he will say how much has been expended on buildings and plant, and what further sums are to be expended on these; and can he state to what extent this factory will decrease the necessity of relying on private factories for the manufacture of small arms.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The estimated total initial expenditure on the buildings and plant is Rs. 37,50,000. The whole of this sum was included in the Estimates for the years 1902–3 and 1903–4. The actual expenditure has not yet been reported by the Government of India. The object of establishing this factory is to make India to a large extent self-supporting in the manufacture of small arms, and this must to some extent diminish the expenditure on supplies from private factories.

Pension of Mr. J. C. Neeson, Late Clerk of Belfast Union.

MR. SLOAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Mr. J. C. Neeson, late clerk of Belfast Union, has claimed a pension on a salary of £1,764 9*s.* 10*d.*, this being the average of the past three years gross receipts as officer for clerk of the union, clerk to the No. 1 Belfast Rural Council, clerk to the Castlereagh Rural Council, compiler of the jurors' lists, compiler of the harbour lists, compensation for the loss of office in 1898 as returning officer for the board of guardians, compiler of the Belfast Parliaments lists, compiler of the Belfast municipal (women's) list, and compensation for the loss of office as compiler of income-tax lists; and, if so, will he instruct the Local Government Board to secure that the Belfast poor rate will be charged only with such sums as pension in such offices as clerk of the union and net emoluments as deputy registrar which properly belong to the Poor Rate Relief Acts.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) I replied to a Question on this matter on the 20th June.† The Local Government Board is not empowered to determine the amount of pension payable to Mr. Neeson. The guardians, I understand, have decided to take the opinion of counsel on the general question of Mr. Neeson's right to pension on the gross amount of his salary and emoluments in respect of his office as clerk of the union.

War Trophies—Alleged Refusal by London County Council.

MR. WHITMORE (Chelsea): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the refusal of the London

---

† See (4) *Debates.*, cxxxvi, 493.

County Council to take charge of the two guns allotted to London by the War Office, he will take steps in conjunction with the First Commissioner of Works to have them placed in some suitable public position.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) No letter has been received from the London County Council refusing the guns allotted to that body, but, should such a refusal be received, the guns would be allotted to some other town within the boundary of the Fourth Army Corps.

Epizootic Lymphangitis among Army Horses.

MR. HAYES FISHER (Fulham): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that a disease called epizootic lymphangitis has been introduced into this country from South Africa by Army horses; and that a large number of cases have occurred recently at numerous barracks; and whether, with a view of preventing its introduction into civilian stables, he will withhold the sale of cast horses until the disease has been stamped out, especially, as owing to the incubation period extending to several months, horses may be sold in an occult stage of the disease, even though veterinarily examined on the day of sale.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) It is the case that a disease called epizootic lymphangitis has appeared in this country, and it is believed that it was introduced from South Africa. 394 Army horses have been infected with this disease at various stations, of which number 254 have been destroyed, 32 have recovered, and 108 are still under treatment. Orders have been given that the sale of horses to the public from affected units will be withheld for six months from the date of the last case in that unit. I am informed that this action will effectually prevent the introduction of the disease into civilian stables.

Trading Privileges of British-Indians in the Transvaal.

SIR MANCHERJEE BHOWNAGGREE (Bethnal Green, N.E.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if his attention has been called to a debate which took place in the Legislative Council at Pretoria last Tuesday, in which the local Colonial Secretary gave an assurance that he intended to introduce legislation restricting the trading privileges at present enjoyed by British-Indian traders in the Transvaal, when an Amendment was adopted urging the local Government to press to a conclusion the negotiations on this subject with the Imperial Government; and, if so, will he state what steps he proposes to take with reference to such intended legislation; and whether the legislation in question is directed against the subjects of the Mikado of Japan as well as against British-Indian subjects.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) I have seen the newspaper telegrams to which the hon. Member refers. I am not in a position to make any statement at present as to the legislation in question.

LABOURERS (IRELAND) BILL.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover) moved that this Bill be committed to the Standing Committee on Trade. He said he made this proposal on behalf of the Government in order that they might have some chance of fulfilling the pledges which had been made, and on account of the congested state of business in the House. He would be out of order if he referred to the merits of the Bill, or stated what action he would be able to take in accepting this or that Amendment on it. He might remind the House that during the passing of the Land Act last year he pledged the Government to do all in their power to pass a Labourers Bill this year. That pledge was given quite indifferently to hon. Members on either side of the House. They joined in a common interest in this matter. So far, so good. But the Government now found that some hon. Members who took a great interest in the labourers held that this Bill was almost worthless. He should have to demonstrate the contrary, but it would take time and there was no time for that at this stage of the session if they tried to deal with the Bill in Committee of the Whole House. What he would suggest was that the Bill should go upstairs to the Standing Committee, that the Government should consider all the Amendments from either side of the House, and that they should there discover whether this could be made a useful measure or no. If they did not take that course they would waste some of the very short time at their disposal, and, by so doing, prejudice the chances of any other Bill to which the Government had been equally committed, or committed in even a higher degree. He moved this Motion in the interest of Members on both sides of the House, who were agreed that something ought to be done.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Order [24th June] for Committee be read and discharged, and the Bill be committed to the Standing Committee on Trade, etc."—(*Mr. Wyndham.*)

Mr. WILLIAM MOORE (Antrim, N.) said he might be permitted at the beginning to make a proposal to the Chief Secretary, whose reply might very largely alter the attitude he and his friends took up on this subject. To enter into a discussion on the merits or demerits of the Bill would, he thought, be out of order. He was about to make a proposal the acceptance of which would, he thought, facilitate the passage of the Bill, and save the time about which the Chief Secretary was so anxious. There was one section of the Bill to which they had the greatest objection. It was not necessary to the machinery of the Bill that it should remain, and it was distinct from the rest of the Bill in its effects on the part of the country he and his friends represented. Before beginning to discuss the Motion, he wished to give the Chief Secretary an opportunity of saying how far he was prepared to meet them, and to tell him that if he would omit Section 13, which would entail a loss of £10,000 to Ulster, there would be little objection from that part of the House to reasonable Amendments from the other side. He did not think this an unreasonable proposal to make, and on the manner in which the Chief Secretary dealt with it depended their attitude on the Motion. He observed no sign of assent, and having made his proposal——

Mr. WYNDHAM: I only speak with the leave of the House, but if I indicated to the hon. Member the attitude the Government is prepared to take on this Amendment, all hon. Members who have Amendments in which they take interest would be entitled to ask similar Questions. I think there is a great deal to say on the matter raised by the hon. Member and on other matters, and I assure the House I shall approach the Amendments upstairs with a desire to do what is fair to all parties interested.

Mr. WILLIAM MOORE said he quite understood the Chief Secretary's position. Still, it would have been quite possible for him to meet them on this point if he had so desired. He himself had held out the olive branch. [A Nationalist Member: The Orange branch.] It had not been accepted. He had no option, therefore, but to point out to the House the reasons—and he thought they were weighty reasons—why they should do nothing to facilitate the passage of the Bill. The Chief Secretary had given as the reason for sending the Bill to Grand Committee that its passage would be facilitated. With regard to what had been said of the Bill that was to follow, he thought every cat must hang by its own tail, and whether the next Bill was an Irish, a Scotch, or an English Bill was immaterial to the question. The Bill was supposed to be the fulfilment of pledges given not only during last session but also in the King's Speech. As far as fulfilling those pledges was concerned they had no objection to raise. The question how far part of the Bill, not in fulfilment of the pledge, was a settlement of the question was another matter.

*Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is now proceeding to discuss whether the Bill fulfils the pledges given in a previous session. That is not in order on this Motion.

Mr. WILLIAM MOORE said he bowed to the ruling, but he would point out that the Bill was proposed for the purpose of settling the claims of a very large section of the community. This he thought a matter for the House of Commons itself. He remembered when the Land Act was introduced in 1902, and a similar proposal was made that it should go to a Grand Committee, the hon. Member for Waterford, on behalf of those associated with him, indignantly rejected such a proposal, and that action was, he was bound to say, justified, because next year a better Bill was the result. He should have liked to have heard from the Chief Secretary why a Bill which proposed to solve the land question should be dealt with by the House, and a Bill which proposed to solve the labourers' question sent to Grand Committee. He supposed it could not be argued that the claims of one section were not so important as the claims of the other. Therefore, he suggested that, whatever the state of the session, the House should keep the Bill for discussion. The Chief Secretary seemed to think it would be a public calamity if the Bill did not become law that session. That calamity, however, he and his friends could bear with equanimity, as would become more and more evident to the Chief Secretary as the discussion went on, whether the Bill was retained in the House or went to Committee. What would be saved? The Bill would certainly be amended—hon. Members opposite said that, though the Bill was not a good Bill now, they hoped by Amendments they could improve it. The Chief Secretary had announced, as he did on every occasion of Irish debate, his sympathy with all Irish views and his readiness to consider such Amendments from either side as might be brought before him. They knew the right hon. Gentleman would find himself in Committee with a majority of Members opposite, for English Members would not attend a Committee on an Irish Bill, and they all knew what would be the result of the Chief Secretary's sympathies. He thought, therefore, it would be very undesirable for them, objecting as they did to the contentious parts of the Bill, to let it get into such a stage. He was rather digressing from his argument, which was that the Bill would come back amended; and that would involve a day's discussion in the House. He could assure the Chief Secretary that if ever it got through Grand Committee it would certainly occupy one day on Report.

There was no particular enthusiasm for the Bill, and why it should be forced through, for really it was forcing it through to send it to Grand Committee, he could not understand. He could not see why the ordinary principles should be departed from, and why this matter of public legislation should have more than the ordinary chance of getting through. Another reason why the Bill should not go to Committee was that it was a highly contentious Bill, containing a proposal under which a large sum of money would be transferred from one part of Ireland to another. Again and again it had been urged in the House that they should retain in their own hands measures which were highly contentious. Moreover, if the Bill should be sent to the Grand Committee, hon. Members would be entitled to debate every line, every word, every provision. What that meant they had had a forcible example in proceedings on another Bill. He only referred to that Bill as an example of a contentious Bill which the machinery of the Grand Committee failed to carry through. If this Bill would be equally contentious and equally opposed, that was an argument against sending it to a Grand Committee. It was perfectly obvious that if two or three members of the Committee opposed the Bill—and he could promise that the opposition was not limited to two or three Members—after a fortnight the Chief Secretary would have to do as a brother Minister had done in the case of the Bill he had mentioned, namely, ask the permission of the Grand Committee to withdraw it. The Bill might endure for a fortnight before the Grand Committee and then the labours of the House would be lost. He had no desire to vex or annoy the Chief Secretary, but he should like to save him from the ignominy of being compelled to ask leave of the House to drop this darling god-child. He also objected to the Bill going to this Committee because the Committee was composed of business men who were commercial princes and trade magnates, who could not be expected to possess a knowledge, indispensable in this case, of the labourers' question in Ireland. These gentlemen could not be expected to deal with the tangled skein of——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

MR. WILLIAM MOORE said that if he was not permitted to pursue that line of argument he would ask permission to be allowed to say that this was a lawyers' Bill. He would go farther and say it was an Irish lawyers 'Bill—a Bill which could only be understood by gentlemen who had experience of the working of the Labourers Acts in Ireland. In the Grand Committee he supposed that knowledge was not over-abundant, and that fact would not help to pass the measure. It was also unfortunate that a Bill involving so much contention and special knowledge should be thrown upon the Grand Committee at this time of the session. It really meant that the labours of the Committee would be futile. It was also a long one, and already there were eleven pages of Amendments. That showed its contentious nature and also the uselessness of sending it to a Grand Committee. If it received careful attention it would occupy at least a month of Parliamentary time. The number of Amendments would swell probably still more. Sending it to a Grand Committee might be regarded as a short way of dealing with the Bill, but short cuts were not always the shortest way of getting a Bill through. There were plenty of proposals in it on which Members on both sides of the House would agree, and he would suggest that the contentious subjects should be omitted and those on which there was agreement retained. The opposition to the Bill was such that the Chief Secretary could not expect to see it back from the Committee on Report stage under three weeks. But if his suggestion were adopted the progress of the Bill would be materially hastened.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.) said that he also believed that the Bill should remain in this House on the ground that it contained contentious matter. He and his colleagues considered it to be their duty to oppose the Bill in the most strenuous way they could on account of the inclusion of Section 13, which robbed the measure of any value it might otherwise possess. But independent of that section, almost every clause contained matters of the greatest importance which should be thoroughly debated. A great reform was, for instance, proposed by transferring the powers at present exercised by the Local Government Board to the county councils. They were very inadequate and would require very drastic Amendment, and for that reason could be much better discussed in that House than in Committee. There was a very important and desirable Amendment dealing with the question of simplification of title, and which every lawyer in the House would admit required the very fullest and most careful consideration.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Gentleman cannot discuss that subject at present.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG said he only meant to discuss the contentious subjects generally. Having regard to the question of the transfer of power from the Local Government Board to the county councils, to the technicalties of the measure, and to the difficulty of dealing with the many points which were bound to arise, he maintained that that House, and not the Committee, was the proper place in which to deal with the Bill. Even though there might be a consensus of opinion among Irish Members as to the desirability of making the changes, he did hope that the Chief Secretary would reconsider his position on the matter of sending the Bill to a Grand Committee. With regard to the particular Committee to which it was to be sent, he and others objected to a Bill of this kind, which was full of legal points from beginning to end, being sent to a Committee on Trade. The scope of this Committee was supposed to be confined to questions relating to trade, manufactures, and shipping. Nobody could contend that this Bill came within that purview. He trusted the House would carefully consider the question whether they would do right to agree to the Chief Secretary's Motion. He would appeal to the Chief Secretary to meet them in the matter of Clause 13.

*MR. SPEAKER: That matter cannot be considered now.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG asked whether it would not be in order to say that the removal of a part of the Bill would take away a great deal of the objection which several hon. Members had to the measure.

The Bill was contentious and the Chief Secretary knew where the contentious matter lay. If the right hon. Gentleman would assure them that this bone of contention would be removed, there was no doubt that the feeling of opposition to the Bill amongst Ulster Members would automatically disappear. They all agreed that the Bill was useful, but he believed that labourers would not be one whit worse off if the Bill were not passed. As long as it contained the contentious matter he had referred to, the opposition to the measure in the Grand Committee would be bound to be so great that a great deal of valuable time would be lost before the Bill could possibly get through. Was the Bill worth all this ? Even with the best intentions, without erasing a great deal in the Bill, and building up a new one, they could do very little. There were some things which they would be glad and willing to see passed into law. The contentious matter, however, was so great that it was doubtful whether the Bill could ever become law. If this matter was removed, and only the innocuous and harmless matter left in, the measure might possibly do the labourers of Ireland some small good.

*MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.) said he had the great and unaccustomed felicity of agreeing with his colleagues from Ulster; that was to say he agreed with them in the conclusions which they had reached, but not with their arguments. The main objection he had to the Bill was in regard to its financial provisions, and if the Bill was referred to the Standing Committee on Trade or Law, it would be perfectly impossible to introduce Amendments bearing upon the financial question because such Amendments would be wholly out of order. He was a very old Member of the Standing Committee, and he had seen that ruling given over and over again; and if any alteration was to be made in the financial clauses of the Bill, the Bill would have to be re-committed to the Committee of the Whole House. That was his serious objection to the course proposed. The hon. and learned Member for Antrim had quoted the precedent of 1902 when the Chief Secretary introduced a Bill and expressed his willingness to send that Bill to a Standing Committee at the end of the session He contended that the hon. and learned Gentleman was not entitled to cite that as a precedent for the course now proposed. He was abused and held up to opprobrium in Ulster for having objected to that course being taken on the ground that he had spoiled the settlement of the question. He did not entertain any objection to the Bill *per se* going to a Standing Committee. He would have been glad to see it sent to a Standing Committee of all the Irish Members, and he believed it would have been admirably dealt with by such a Committee. Some Ulster Members had objected to the Bill going upstairs because it contained one clause with which they did not agree; that was a very weak ground for objection. He did not share it and he thought the House should not be frightened by the bogey held out that the Bill would be roughly treated in the Committee. After all, they had got to the month of July. What he meant to say was that the month of July did not conduce to the intelligent discussion of Bills upstairs. They had had complete proof of that in the present week. He knew that his opinion was shared to a large extent on the other side of the House that this was an inadequate Bill. The weak point of the Bill was in the financial clause, and he did not believe it could be amended in the Committee upstairs.

MR. WYNDHAM said there was precedent for that. It could be done by Section 18 of the Act of 1883.

*MR. T. W. RUSSELL said that if that was the case it simplified the matter considerably. But he persisted in his view that the financial question could not be discussed by the Committee. He did not object to Clause 13, or any other clause, going to the Committee if it were possible to do in the Committee what ought to be done with regard to the matter of finance. If that could be done he would vote for its going upstairs. Manifestly this Bill should go to the Standing Committee on Law and not on Trade. If the Chief Secretary could assure him that the question of the financial portion of the Bill could be thoroughly overhauled in the Standing Committee, his difficulty would be entirely removed and he would vote for its being committed. If that could not be done—and he believed it could not—he would vote against it. Unless they could deal with the financial part of the Bill it was absolutely useless, and would mock the hopes and aspirations of the Irish nation.

Question put

The House divided :—Ayes, 223; Noes, 10. (Division List No. 214.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork,N.E.)
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hon.SirH.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour,Rt. Hon, A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour,Rt.HnGeraldW.(Leeds
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bathurst, Hon. AllenBenjamin
Bill, Charles
Blake, Edward
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boland, John
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Brassey, Albert
Brigg, John
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Carson, Rt. Hon., Sir Edw. H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cavendish, V.C. W.(Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A.(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Colomb, Rt. Hon. Sir JohnC.R.
Condon, Thomas Joseph.
Crean, Eugene
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cullinan, J.
Davenport, William Bromley
Delany, William
Denny, Colonel
Delvin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Delvin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dickson, Charles Scott
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke,Rt.Hon.SirWilliam Hart
Egerton Hon. A. de Tatton
Fenwick, Charles
Fergusson,Rt. Hn.SirJ.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald,Sir RobertPenrose
Fitzroy,Hon. EdwardAlgernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flower, Sir Ernest
Flynn, James Christopher
Forster, Henry William
Furness, Sir Christopher
Graham, Henry Robert
Grant, Corrie
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,SirE.W(B'ry SEdm'nds
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hayden, John Patrick
Healy, Timothy Michael
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Higham, John Sharpe
Horner, Frederick William
Horniman, Frederick John
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, J.(Midd., Tottenham)
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kennaway,Rt.Hon.Sir JohnH.
Kennedy,VincentP. (Cavan,W.
Kenyon, Hon.Geo.T.(Denbigh)
Kerr, John
Kilbride, Denis
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law,Andrew Bonar (Glasgow))
Law, Hugh Alex.(Donegal, W.)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool
Lawson,JohnGrant(Yorks.N.R
Layland-Barrat, Francis
Leamy, Edmund
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants.,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Pirkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long,Rt.Hn. Walter(Bristol,S)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas,ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth)
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur,Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Majendie, James A. H.
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn .W. F.
Maxwell, W.J.H. (Dumfriessh.)
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Middlemore, Jn. Throgmorton
Mitchell, William (Burnley)
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Mooney, John J.
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murphy, John
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray,Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary,Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Doherty, William
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury
Parkes, Ebenezer
Parrott, William
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Roe, Sir Thomas
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)

Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Thompson, Dr. E C (Monagh'n, N
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Wallace, Robert
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Sir Charles G E. (Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wills, Sir Frederick
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H. (Yorks.)
Wood, James
Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Huddersf'd
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood, and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Clive, Captain Percy A.
Corbett, T. L. (Down North)
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Russell, T. W.
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J.
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Tollemache, Henry James

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. William Moore and Mr. Lonsdale.

IRISH LAND BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) said that under ordinary circumstances he should have supposed that the right hon. Gentleman would have made this Motion in a speech to the House. He had no right to complain that the right hon. Gentleman had taken another course. The right hon. Gentleman had intimated to him a few moments ago his desire to speak at the end of the debate, and in these circumstances it devolved upon him (Mr. Redmond) to move the Motion standing in his name upon the Paper. He moved this Motion as the outcome of the decision arrived at in a national convention held in Dublin a few months ago. That convention was an assembly which might fairly be said to be representative of the national sentiment throughout the whole country. These assemblies represented not merely branches of the political organisation with which the Irish representatives on those Benches were identified, but all the elected public bodies in Ireland—county councils, district councils, and so forth, all through the country. They were representative of the clergy of all denominations, or they were open to the clergy of all denominations, and, therefore, he felt it was only fair to say that the decision unanimously come to by an assembly of that kind was a decision representing the overwhelming sentiment of the Nationalists of Ireland. He therefore moved this Resolution as the outcome of that convention and on behalf of the Irish Nationalist Party in the House of Commons.

The first thing he desired to say to the right hon. Gentleman and the House was this. This Motion was not to be taken by the right hon. Gentleman or anybody else as an expression of hostility or unfriendliness to the proper working of the Land Act of last year or as indicating any departure whatever from the attitude they adopted on the Third Reading of the Bill at the end of last year. This Motion was a protest against the action of the Government in so framing this Bill as to preclude the possibility of discussing those various defects which had come to light in the working of the former Bill, and in so framing it as to limit discussion to one particular drafting defect which affected the payment of the bonus in certain cases. Now he might say that exactly this time last year, when speaking upon the Third Reading, he used the following words which he hoped he might be forgiven for quoting to the House. He said on that occasion—

> "We cannot remain silent upon this occasion lest our critics may say that our silence was an indication of our satisfaction with the shape in which the Bill stands at this moment, and that we accept full responsibility for everything in it and for its successful working. I had better say at once this is not our Bill, it

is the Bill of the Government, the responsibility for it rests not upon us but upon the Government. The Bill as it stands is marked by defects and omissions which make it necessary for us to emphasise the fact that after all the responsibility is not ours, the Bill is the Government's Bill."

He then proceeded to point out those various matters in which his friends and he considered the measure defective. He though the could truly say that upon every one of those points the working of the Act, so far as it had gone, had proved that they were right, and he moved this Motion as a protest against this manœuvre on the part of the Government whereby they were prevented from discussing on this Bill the various defects which had come to light and which urgently needed amendment.

The actual proposal in the Bill was simplicity itself; it was to rectify certain mistakes in the drafting of the measure whereby the admitted intentions of Parliament had been frustrated. One of those mistakes apparently prevented the possibility of payment of the bonus in certain cases on the sale of untenanted land, and he wished to say that nothing that they did or said upon this matter should be taken as indicating any hostility upon their part to the payment of the bonus for the sale of untenanted land. On the contrary, they all recognised that upon the rapid sale of the grass lands of Ireland, upon the rapid distribution of those lands in the enlargement of uneconomic holdings in the country, and in the provision for evicted tenants, depended absolutely the settlement of the most acute phase of the Irish land question; and if through that extraordinary blunder on the part of the Government draftsmen, and through the extraordinary oversight on the part of the Law Officers of the Crown, who had charge of the legal portion of this Bill passing through the House, a mistake had arisen in the wording of the measure which destroyed one of the chief inducements to promote the sale of the grass lands in Ireland then no one would dream of taking the responsibility of preventing the rectification of that mistake. But they believed that the sale of the untenanted grass lands of the country had not been in the main stopped by the mistake. The right hon. Gentleman on the preceding night, in the very interesting speech that he made, explained that so far as the operations of the Congested Districts Board were concerned, that mistake did not operate because he told them that he and the Board had taken the responsibility of undertaking to pay the bonus, and that the sale of land up to the present, so far as the Congested Districts Board was concerned, had proceeded as if the mistake had not taken place. And what had been the result? He had not the exact figures, but in the nine months working of the Bill the amount of untenanted land purchased by the Congested Districts Board had been lamentably small, and the reason why it had been so very small must be looked for quite apart altogether from the mistake in the wording. That was exactly what they predicted during the Committee stage last year, and on the Third Reading also they said that quite apart from the question of the bonus, the measure as it stood would not lead to the sale of the grass lands of Connaught and the West of Ireland as rapidly as was necessary. He said at that time—

> "We do not believe the Bill as it stands will be able to grapple successfully with the congested districts question. The constitution of the Board is such that we do not believe that it has any serious chance of being able to settle this question, and I am convinced that in a comparatively short space of time the Government will find that the advice which we gave them as the result of our experience, and which they have rejected, must be accepted if this question is to be settled."

And he said now that the failure of the Act to break up the grass lands of Connaught was due not to the defect with reference to the bonus, but to an entirely different cause. First of all he believed it was due to some extent, perhaps to a large extent, to the present constitution and policy of the Congested Districts Board. Last year they pressed strongly upon the right hon. Gentleman the necessity of amending the constitution of that Board. But he neglected their advice, and he believed himself that, until some radical amendment was made, its work would not be carried out with that vigour which was essential if this question was to be settled in a short space of time. But a great deal more important was the absence of all compulsory powers in the hands of the Board to acquire these grass lands. This was not a question of general compulsory purchase in Ireland. It was a limited question which came up for discussion in the land conference which initiated the Land Bill of last year, and there was no difference of opinion at that land conference between the representatives of landlords and tenants that, so far as Connaught or the grass lands in the West and Congested Districts of Ireland were concerned, compulsory powers were desirable and would be necessary, and a paragraph was put in the report which plainly indicated that that was the unanimous opinion. The opinion had been almost unanimous everywhere upon the subject. The Board itself, as the right hon. Gentleman remembered, in 1895 passed a unanimous resolution declaring that they could not satisfactorily carry on their work unless they had compulsory powers, and he could appeal to him himself, because last year in speaking of this question he declined to put compulsory powers into his Bill. What was the reason he gave? Not that he thought compulsory powers were wrong, but because he thought they were unnecessary. He said the inducements to sell under the Bill were so great that there would be no difficulty in acquiring the grass lands of the West. He clearly indicated the view that if his anticipation proved to be false and the inducements to sell were not sufficient, he himself would have no objection to the principle of compulsion as applied to this particular case. He (Mr. Redmond) and his colleagues protested against the form in which the Bill was drawn, because it prevented any possibility of raising the question of compulsory powers for the Congested Districts Board, and hindered the discussion of questions which were operating to prevent the successful working of the Act in the West of Ireland.

There were certain features in the working of the Land Act, so far as it had gone, which undoubtedly were causing the gravest possible anxiety, and which, in the highest interests of the country, ought to be immediately the subject of careful consideration and amendment of the law. The first—he put it first because he believed it was most urgent—was the question of the untenanted lands and of the enlargement of uneconomic holdings. If everything else in the Act were perfect, if it worked all over the country successfully and satisfactorily, and if this question of the breaking up of the grass lands were left out, the land question in Ireland would not be near a settlement. It was from the question of the uneconomic holdings that all the trouble, all the misery, all the crime, and all the emigration which had been caused by the land question had sprung, and it was futile to think that any measure—even although it worked satisfactorily elsewhere — would settle the Irish land war if that portion which related to the West of Ireland was unsatisfactory, and yet the Government had jockeyed them out of the possibility of effectively discussing this question, and of proposing any amendments in the law which in nine months working had been proved to be defective.

The second question which was exercising the public mind in Ireland and was causing the gravest anxiety, was the question of the evicted tenants. Again, he said with reference to the evicted tenants' question what he had said with reference to Connaught—there could be no settlement of the Irish land question which did not include a settlement of the evicted tenants question, and he was afraid the Estates Commissioners did not seem to realise how much of the success of the measure throughout Ireland depended upon their attitude with regard to the evicted tenants. He wished hon. Gentlemen to realise that there could be no peace, no settlement, and no end of the land war until these men were restored to their homes or were given farms elsewhere. Again, they were absolutely precluded from raising any question in Committee or any Amendment. But perhaps the most widely serious aspect of all was the action which had been taken by a large section of the Irish landlords themselves. He knew that the Bill of last year gave full power to the Land Commissioners to say what was an estate and what was not, and they had full power to say to the landlord, "We will not hold this to be an estate and will not allow the sale to go through unless you put in along with the tenanted land the grass lands which you have." He knew that they had that power; but he knew nothing of the exercise of that power by them. It would be satisfactory to the whole country if the right hon. Gentleman would give them an assurance that in cases of that kind the Estates Commissioners would decline to define as an estate any portion of tenanted land brought in where the landlord refused to sell the grass lands in his possession. They had knowledge of cases in which there had been a refusal to restore evicted tenants to their holdings, and they had particularly a case in which Lord Lansdowne had absolutely refused to consider the question of the restoration of an evicted tenant. His was not the case of an ordinary landlord. He was a member of the Government, the Leader of the House of Lords, and a member of the Government also that promoted the Land Act, and one of the landlords who approved of the land conference. Last year an Amendment was moved in the House of Lords by the Earl of Westmeath, the object of which was practically to destroy the evicted tenants' clause in the Bill. That was resisted by the Government, and Lord Lansdowne said—

> "If this Bill had in his eyes one recommendation more than another it was that they saw in it the possibility of the restoration of peace and goodwlll between landlords and tenants in Ireland. Surely,

added Lord Lansdowne,

> the Earl of Westmeath and Lord Barrymore must know that this provision for the restoration of the evicted tenants, or their representatives in suitable cases, to the holdings which they once occupied was an essential element in the compromise; and that if that element had been excluded the Bill might not at that moment be on the Table of the House at all."

That statement was quite inconsistent with the action which had been, as far as he knew, rightly attributed to Lord Lansdowne, and it was rather a serious matter when an example of that kind was set by a person representing the Government, and who himself was one of the authors of the Bill. Further than that, there unquestionably was on foot in many parts of Ireland an attempt by certain landlords to force their tenants to buy on terms fixed by the landlords themselves, by calling up the hanging gale, and by proceeding for old arrears. That was a most deplorable thing if it were true. He took his information not only from the Press, but from his colleagues, who came there and spoke of what they knew in their own districts. Their statement was that hanging gales, some of which had been in existence since the famine, had been suddenly called up—in many cases simply to bring pressure to bear on the tenants to agree to any terms the landlord might propose. The result was that over a large portion of Ireland there was friction, and he was afraid there was trouble brewing; and just as the hopes and anticipations aroused by the Act of last year were great so would the trouble be serious and deep if those hopes were disappointed. Yet the Government, in face of that state of things, refused the Irish Members an opportunity on this Bill of discussing Amendments to the Act which had been shown to be necessary by the working of the last nine months. In taking that course, in his judgment, the Government was acting with unheard-of folly. The Irish Party's attitude towards the measure had not changed. The hon. Member for East Mayo said last year—

> "This Bill leaves the House with the goodwill of the Irish Party, and with a pledge from us that we will give it fair play, with an honest desire, according to our lights, to make it work."

That was their attitude then; it had been their attitude since; it was their attitude now. But they felt bound to protest against being deprived of the opportunity of a full and free discussion of those defects which experience had shown was marring the working of the Act, and of proposing Amendments which experience had proved to be necessary if the measure was really to secure the beneficent results to which they all looked forward last year. For these reasons he moved the Motion standing in his name.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork County, E.) in seconding the Amendment, said it embodied the conclusion unanimously adopted at the recent National Convention, and might therefore be regarded as practically the mandate of the Irish people. The object of the Government Bill was merely to remedy certain defects in the drafting of the Land Act of last year, and, therefore, it was, of course, a matter of far more concern to the landlords than to the tenants. At the same time this Bill, under ordinary circumstances, would be useful and would have the support of Irish Members, because it would be very desirable to facilitate the working of the Land Act if only for the sake of the restoration of evicted tenants to their homes. But, under existing conditions and in view of the exorbitant prices demanded by Irish landlords, he thought it extremely doubtful whether it was desirable to accelerate the present pace. It was intended that the tenants should gain at least some advantage from the bonus; but experience showed that the bonus had only served to increase the price of land. It seemed to have whetted the appetites of the Irish landlords. The Chief Secretary seemed to measure the success of the Act by the number of sales that had been effected. He ventured, however, to think that the real point was whether the tenants were getting value for their money. If the terms on which the sale of land was taking place were equitable and just, the more speedily the land was transferred from the landlords to the tenants the better; but, on the other hand, if the tenants were paying more than the market value of the land, each transaction increased the risk of the Irish ratepayers, because undoubtedly it must place an undue burden upon the purchaser. The whole question turned upon the point whether the terms were fair or unfair, safe or unsafe.

What had happened during the past twelve months to boom the price of land in Ireland? While prices had gone up the value of Irish land had steadily gone down. That appeared to be a very unnatural situation. He was able to speak from personal experience and knowledge of the subject, because he was a practical Irish farmer, and although most of the land which he farmed was his own property, and no land in Ireland was farmed better, he found it more difficult each year to make any profit whatever. This was owing undoubtedly to increasing foreign competition and to the increasing cost of production. What, then must be the condition of farmers who were struggling to pay heavy annual instalments? He considered their situation most serious, and that fact ought to be recognised by the Chief Secretary. The terms would be too high even if the rents were fair rents; but how could judicial rents be fair when they were all fixed by landlords and not by tenants? The Attorney-General for Ireland had never packed an Irish jury as the present Government and the landlords between them had packed the Irish Land Commission. The question might be asked, why did the tenants agree to pay preposterous prices? He thought the chief reason was, as his hon. and learned friend had pointed out, that the last disastrous year left them at the mercy of the landlords' combination because, although there were exceptions, the vast majority of the landlords in Ireland refused to recognise the disastrous losses their tenants suffered last year and pressed for the last penny of rent. Consequently the tenants very naturally took refuge in purchase at almost any price. The tenants were tempted to do this because under the Land Act of last year they were able to add the current year's rent to the purchase money and that no doubt gave them some temporary relief. He was afraid that in many cases the Irish tenants had clutched at this privilege as a drowning man clutched at a straw. The object of the landlords' combination had been to force up the price of Irish land to a fictitious value, and unfortunately that object had been attained. As the Chief Secretary knew very well, the current prices were far in excess of the prices paid under previous Acts, and in many cases they were far in excess of the prices of farms recently sold by the official inspectors and even by the landlords themselves. Therefore he thought it was absolutely essential to revert to the old system of inspection in order to safeguard the interests of the tenants.

As an illustration of how the present system was working in Ireland perhaps he might be allowed to mention as a case in point the instance of the Edlin tenants in his own constituency. Last winter he offered the landlord on behalf of these tenants twenty-two years purchase of second-term rents but that offer was curtly refused and under threats of pains and penalties the landlord demanded an impossible price and the immediate payment of all rent due. The tenants having offered the utmost farthing they could afford to pay very properly stood firmly to their offer, and what the result. On Saturday last, just as these farms were being put up for sale by the sheriff of the Court, the landlord yielded to firmness what he had denied to justice and fair play and accepted the terms which he (the hon. Member) had offered six months ago. In this instance, all had gone well, and "all's well that ends well." For this, however, the tenants had only to thank themselves. He thought the Irish tenant should be able to obtain justice without having to fight for it. For himself he had always been in favour of the Land Conference policy. He had invariably found tenants not only willing but anxious to meet their landlords in a liberal and generous spirit, but he regretted to say that he had very seldom found that spirit reciprocated by the landlords. He thought the time had come when this question should be looked in the face and if some change was not made, and very soon made, in the direction indicated in this Amendment it was very doubtful whether the Act of last year might not result in disaster instead of proving a blessing to the country. Compulsion was the only remedy and it had been recognised as the only real solution of the question. He begged to second the Motion.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out from the word, 'That' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words, 'no measure dealing with the Amendment of the Irish Land Act of 1903 can be accepted as satisfactory which deals only with facilitating Irish landlords in obtaining the bonus, and which provides no remedy for the grave defects of that Act affecting Irish tenants, particularly the creation of a system of zones leading to the unjust inflation of prices, and the absence of provisions for the compulsory acquisition of untenanted land essential for the enlargement of holdings, the restoration of evicted tenants, and the final settlement of the Irish land question' instead thereof." — (*Mr. John Redmond.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. FLYNN (Cork County, N.) said that all along the tenants had been most anxious that the Land Act should work smoothly and rapidly and they had been most anxious to meet the landlords fairly. Speaking as one who had had a good deal of experience in one part of Ireland during the past nine months upon this question he had no hesitation in saying that that feeling had not been reciprocated by the landlords as a rule. He thought the hon. and gallant Member who had just spoken might have emphasised his argument in regard to the case he had alluded to by stating that that very property was actually offered at a lower price to the tenants—at a lower number of years purchase—before there was any talk of purchase. The unfortunate thing in regard to this bonus which was based upon the security of Irish funds and Irish rates was that instead of assisting the tenants it had been diverted to stimulate and raise the price to be paid for the land by the tenants. Nobody who had watched the course of events since November last could deny that the Amendment and the arguments used by the hon. and learned Member for Waterford were the very quintessence of moderation. The tenants naturally expected some share of this bonus and had thought that it would make their terms of purchase easier, but they were mistaken. He challenged any representative of the landlords, or any landlord, to give one single case in which a tenant had asked for a penny or a single farthing of the bonus. There was property in his constituency which was valued at nineteen years purchase under the Ashbourne Acts for which the landlords were now asking twenty-two and twenty-three years purchase together with the bonus. That was a most unlooked for state of things. In this case appetite grew by what it fed on. The landlords' appetite had been spoken of as having been whetted, but in his opinion it had now become voracious. In the case he had mentioned the landlord was looked upon as one of the most generous landlords, but under the stimulus of this bonus his property had gone up to the most preposterous prices and what was intended as a blessing to the tenants had turned out to be a curse. Unless the reforms suggested in the Amendment were carried out a settlement of the land question was impossible.

Mr. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.) said that the introduction of the Land Bill last year led them to hope that a final and satisfactory settlement of the Irish land problem would have been arrived at. During the past century that question had prevented proper attention being given to other great questions, such as education, industrial improvement, and the housing of the working classes, which had been awaiting settlement, and naturally they were delighted at the prospect opened up. He recognised that the Chief Secretary had done everything in his power, with the forces behind him, to settle the whole of this difficult question. But having watched the administration of the Land Act during the past nine or ten months, he was bound to say that the hopes then formed were far from being realised. The blame did not rest with the Irish farmer, who was anxious to do everything in his power to become the owner of his land. But in Ireland land was not fetching its market value but a monopoly value, and even greater than a monopoly value. During the last eighteen years in which the Irish Land Acts had been in operation £22,000,000 worth of land had been transferred from landlords to tenants, and the average price had been not more than seventeen years purchase of the rental—the highest price not being more than twenty-one years purchase. It might be said that the system of agrarian agitation pursued by the Irish people was the cause of the landlords selling at so low a price, and that the Irish people had no regard to the rights of property. He denied that. Sir Alfred Milner, giving evidence before the Commission on the Depreciation of Land Values in 1897, said that the value of Irish land had enormously decreased, and that the value of English land had in the same period decreased from thirty years to eighteen years purchase in Schedule A of the income-tax returns. Sir Robert Giffen, and every other witness before the Commission said the same thing.

On the passing of the Land Act, the tenants of the estates in his own constituency formed a committee of advice and showed that they were only too anxious to do everything in their power, consistently with their own safety, to meet the landlords fairly and reasonably, and had shown their willingness, not only to give the market value, viz., seventeen years purchase, but to give two years purchase more than neighbouring landlords had received under the former land purchase Acts—in addition to which the landlords would have got three years purchase by way of bonus. The Irish tenants had gone further than their own safety entitled them to go in endeavouring to meet the landlords. The landlords, had, however, disappointed the hopes of men who thought they would do something for the country they had robbed for centuries. They had shown themselves hopelessly incompetent to meet the overtures made to them by the Irish tenants. If the landlords' demands were to be accepted, the children and the grandchildren of the Irish tenants would be ruined, and Ireland would be in a condition of national bankruptcy. It was true that the tenants could not compel the landlords to sell; but it was not true that the landlords could not compel the tenants to buy. He had received a letter signed by ten of his constituents stating that between March, 1903, and January, 1904, they had paid three gales of rent, and that they had been asked in the first week of April for a fourth gale. That fourth gale was the hanging gale which had never been previously demanded. Those unfortunate tenants were being persecuted in this manner notwithstanding the scarcity of food and fuel, and after a bad harvest, in order to drive them to purchase.

The landlords contended that they ought to receive an amount which, if invested in trust funds, would produce their present net income. They were, however, pushing their demands a little too far. He challenged any landlord in Ireland to produce books which would show that his net income was 90 per cent., or even 70 per cent. of his gross income. If the landlords were prepared to sell at a price which would produce their genuine net income he would not object; but why should they, of all landlords in the world, demand 90 per cent. of their gross income. According to the Agricultural Depression Commission of 1897, the net income of the landlords in this country was only 51 per cent. of their gross income. The English landlord had markets at his door; and yet his net income was only 51 per cent. of his gross income. The landlords on the western coast of Ireland, however, demanded 90 per cent. of their gross income. That was perfectly monstrous and absurd. The Irish tenant had shown his desire to facilitate the transfer of the land. The Irish landlords had, however, been true to their history; and would not be satisfied with what their colleagues in this country would accept. It had been said that the landlords were ready to help in a settlement; but he would ask how many evicted tenants, who had been living in squalor and misery, had been reinstated? There were over 400 evicted tenants in Kerry; and during the nine months the Act had been in operation not one of them had been reinstated. Neither had the Estates Commissioners taken any step in that direction. It was the duty of the Irish Members to secure justice for these men. One landlord in his constituency, Lord Ventry, had refused to sell at any price. 50 per cent. of his tenants were future tenants; and they had to continue to pay the old rack rents. They could not even have fair rents fixed. Having regard to all these conditions, it was time that the House took action in the interests of future tenants. He sincerely hoped—though he supposed the hope was vain—that the Irish landlords would at last consider the interests of their country, having regard to the advantages which the Act conferred on them and enable the Irish tenants to purchase their holdings at fair prices.

*Mr. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid) did not suppose that any Irish Member—Unionist or Nationalist—was entirely satisfied with the Land Bill which had been brought in by his right hon. friend the Chief Secretary. They all thought that it was too small, and that many points which might usefully have been dealt with, had been omitted from it. He believed, for example, that besides dealing with the bonus, the Chief Secretary would have done well to make an effort to remove another obstacle to land purchase. He referred to the cost of proving title of superior interests, which were now thrown upon the selling landlord. These superior interests were much thicker than was generally supposed. Where they existed it was seldom that a landlord who was willing to sell could make any calculation as to what he might get in the end; because he could form no idea as to the cost of proving the titles of perhaps two or three superior interests of which he might have had no previous knowledge whatever. This uncertainty was deterring many landlords from selling their estates, and he could not help thinking that there was no greater hardship in compelling the owners of superior interests to bear the cost of proving their own titles than there was in making the selling landlord prove his title at his own expense. That was but one of many minor difficulties which would have to be dealt with in another amending Bill if the Land Act of last year was to be completely successful. He did not think that the limited character of the Bill before them was a sufficient reason for its rejection. It would serve a useful purpose by facilitating sales, and therefore he would give it his support. He did not agree with the suggestion which was contained in the Amendment of the hon. Member for Waterford that it was merely a landlords' Bill. The purpose of the measure was to expedite sales under last year's Act, by making clear what was the evident intention of Parliament in regard to the distribution of the bonus. Therefore, it was designed as much in the interests of the tenant farmers as of the landlords; and it was for that reason he should vote for the Second Reading.

The hon. Member for Waterford appeared to desire to upset the entire scheme of last year's Act and throw the whole question of land purchase once more into the melting pot. He could not think that such a course would be in the interests of the tenant farmers of Ireland; and he regretted that the hon. and learned Member had proposed an Amendment which could not fail to encourage agitation and discourage those friendly negotiations upon which the success of any scheme of voluntary land purchase must depend. No one regretted more than he did the attitude which had been adopted by some of the landlords in Ulster. He noticed that at a recent meeting of the Landlords' Convention it was argued that Ulster landlords should get a better price for their land because the security was better. But the landlords did not create the security. The security was good because the people were frugal, industrious, law-abiding and honourably mindful of their just obligations. To contend that because tenant farmers had paid rent regularly and without giving trouble they should now be expected to give a higher price for their land was—he ventured to say — altogether unreasonable. The attempt of some landlords to put a money value upon the sentiment of ownership—which they were called upon to relinquish under the Act—could not be justified; these were simply passing phases of a great movement of reform. He, for one, did not take a gloomy view of the future of the Land Act. On the contrary, considering the short time it had been in operation, he thought the results were very encouraging. He admitted there was a danger of the extremists on both sides bringing about a state of deadlock. He felt confident, however, that the good sense of the tenant farmers would prevail on the one hand to bring about the maintenance of a reasonable spirit; while on the other hand he had no doubt that Parliament would, if necessary, grant compulsory powers of purchase—to be applied in the case of landlords who, in spite of every inducement, refused to sell their estates. As the House knew, he was an advocate of compulsory purchase—as a last resource. He had voted for compulsion in the House, and he should be prepared to do so again should it be found necessary to introduce such a measure to complete land purchase. He believed, however, that a premature agitation for compulsion would simply delay the establishment of the system of occupying ownership of agricultural land in Ireland. The Land Act of last year must have a fair chance. Parliament could assist its operation by removing obstacles to negotiation where they were shown to exist. It would—in his opinion—be a great mistake to make any violent change, at this stage, in the principles or the methods of last year's Act; and, therefore, he trusted the House would reject the Amendment of the hon. Member for Waterford and agree to the Second Reading of the Bill.

*MR. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.) said he rose with considerable hesitation and a full sense of his responsibility as a Member of that House, and as the representative of South Kildare, not only to support the Motion of the hon. and learned Member for Waterford but also to oppose the Bill of the Chief Secretary. Those who had been present at the land debates in that House in the previous year must have been impressed by the fact that the chief case the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary made out for the necessity of the Land Act was the state of the congested districts in Connaught. Let hon. Members refer to what had been done in the way of removing the congestion and restoring evicted tenants in Connaught. He defied anyone to say that the Act had been anything but an abject failure. It had neither relieved congestion nor restored evicted tenants. A good deal of criticism had been passed upon the Congested Districts Board because they had not bought up untenanted lands in Connaught and distributed them among the people, but it was neither fair nor honest to put the whole blame upon them, because they had been unable to purchase untenanted land. The moment the Land Act became law the landlords demanded of Mr. Doran, the representative of the Congested Districts Board in these matters, the unreasonable price of thirty or forty years purchase and the Congested Districts Board should not be blamed because they refused to pay this exorbitant price for land which, before the passing of the Land Act, the landlords would have been glad to sell at sixteen or eighteen years purchase.

The land in Connaught rose and fell in value in sympathy with the price of land in Kildare, Meath, Dublin, and the best parts of Ireland. He frankly admitted he did everything he could to prevent his own constituents from giving twenty-five years purchase on second-term rents, because he believed that twenty-five years purchase on second-term rents reduced twelve and a half per cent. on first-term rents was not a sound bargain. Conditions were too onerous to enable the tenants to pay that price for sixty-eight-and-a-half years and to pay their instalments punctually and with regularity. In 1888, when agricultural produce was worth much more than it was at the present time and when the financial position of the tenant farmer was much better and stronger than it was to-day, the best land was sold for eighteen years purchase; now, with the existing state of affairs in Ireland and in view of the agricultural prices which existed, who could say that twenty-five years purchase on second-term rents was a sound investment? If twenty-five years purchase on second term rents was the fair price to pay now, surely those men who in 1888 purchased land at eighteen years purchase under former Acts, and who had received one decadal reduction in their rents, were going to receive another, and would very soon have a third—surely those people ought to be rich. If, however, hon. Members went among those who purchased in 1888 in Kildare on a portion of the Leinster property, or if they went to the banks to see if their bank balances had increased since 1888, they would find that not only had their bank balances not increased but those who were able to do so were only too glad to show the same balance in 1904 as they were in 1888.

This was a matter that affected England as much as Ireland. He never entered into the Irish land agitation for the simple purpose of improving the Irish tenant's position, but because he thought it was a step towards Home Rule; he believed that once the Irish tenant farmer became a free man he would be a far stronger Home Ruler than ever he had been before. The bargains that had been arrived at in Kildare, where they had twenty-six years purchase without the bonus and nearly twenty-nine with the bonus, had been brought about in this way. The inducement in every case was the fact that one year's rent was forgiven and in some cases an extra half year's rent would be taken off the arrears and added to the purchase money. The mere fact that they were in arrear with their rent, although they had second-terms rents, was proof positive that farming was anything but a paying business in Kildare, and they required large reductions in rent if they were to meet their engagements. The right hon. Gentleman had said that fifty evicted tenants had been reinstated by individual landlords and twenty-three by the Estates Commissioners, that large amounts had been given in grants, and other moneys had been advanced by way of loan, but the question he desired to ask was, had the Estates Commissioners no power to approach a grabber who was in possession of an evicted tenant's holding, who was willing to give up the holding if he was given compensation, and allow the evicted tenant to negotiate with his former landlord? Those were two important points which he should like to have cleared up. Ireland was anxious to know, and he hoped it would know from an authoritative source like the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary, what the exact powers of the Estates Commissioners were. Had they any powers at all, except to advance money, as they had done in the case of the Coolgreaney estate? Was that the full extent of their powers? Because, if so, this Bill would not settle the evicted tenants' questions. In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the evicted tenants had no wish to be transplanted; they wanted no other land than that farm from which they had been evicted. All that every evicted tenant wanted was to be restored to the holding upon which he had been born and brought up, and where his forefathers had lived before him. It was the old associations which the evicted tenants wanted restored more than anything else, and when the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh got up and spoke of the heart-strings of the Irish landlords being broken by having to part with their beloved tenants, whom for years they had denounced as rogues and vagabonds, he would ask those hon. Gentlemen to consider the broken-hearted condition of the evicted tenants. The evicted tenants did not want this land question to remain for ever open, and in order that a settlement might be arrived at, where they could not be reinstalled, they were willing to go on to other farms of approximately the same size as those from which they had been evicted, but, as he had said, their hearts' desire was to be restored to their old holdings. Their silence on the last Land Bill had not been properly considered in this light. It had been regarded as cowardice; but there was a limit to human endurance, and, if the right hon. Gentleman continued to deal with this matter in the dilettante fashion in which he had been dealing with it, before he left the Irish Office his eyes and ears would be opened on the general question of land purchase.

The right hon. Gentleman had stated that the real security for the financial success of these transactions of land purchase was the difference of 20 per cent. between the future annuity and the second-term rent. He believed that was too slender a margin on which to build up the prosperity of Ireland for the next sixty-eight-and-a-half years. He wanted to see the Irish race raised out of the slough of despond in which they had been for so many years, and he thought that in all likelihood that this 20 per cent., especially on the large tillage farms of Ireland, would be eaten up by the increased price of labour. He believed that the Irish agricultural labourer in almost every instance in the past had not had sufficient remuneration for his labour, and it was because of that fact that they had left the country in such large numbers. They would never, in his opinion, succeed in keeping ambitious or intelligent labourers in Ireland unless the wages approximated somewhat to the wages earned in other countries. The average price paid for Irish land since the passing of the Land Act was twenty-one years purchase of first - term rents and twenty-three years purchase of second-term rents. The price had gone up in practically the same ratio as the price of agricultural produce had gone down. Irish land was one of the worst securities in the world. Yet it was bringing a much higher price than ground-rents in the best part of Dublin. That was a most anomalous state of affairs. It was a thing beyond his comprehension that the landlord should get more because the farmer earned less. He was told that the rate of interest on the annuity being 3¼ per cent., instead of 4 per cent., as under the Ashbourne Acts, would enable the tenant farmer to give a greater number of years purchase, but the decadal reductions under the former system were worth 20 per cent. Under this Bill there was no provision for decadal reductions. He submitted that the purchasers under this Act should be in the same position as the men who purchased under the Ashbourne Acts. It was because the acceptance of these terms gave him some temporary relief, because it put off the evil day for another year or two, that the tenant agreed to them. He would like to know of an English landlord who got twenty-six years purchase for agricultural land. There would be a great many English landlords who would be only too glad to get it.

It was because he was convinced that the transactions that had taken place under the Land Act were unsound financially that he should vote against this Bill. He could well remember that in his younger days he was fond of buying penny books which graphically described the exploits of such men as Grant and Frieney, two well-known highwaymen, who robbed the people of the country to their hearts' content, until friendly police appeared on the scene and drove them off. Well, he ventured to think that these men were not much worse than some of the Irish landlords to-day. He was justified in saying that, because under the Land Act, by the system of zones which took away the safeguard of inspection, they had got rid of the friendly policemen whose duty it was to beat off the hereditary plunderer. The Irish Members now asked that the system of inspection should be restored. Who were the inspectors appointed under previous Purchase Acts? They had been entirely taken from the landlord classes; they were landlords' sons, sons of landlords and land agents, and they over and over again reported that the prices agreed on were too high and did not give sufficient security to the Treasury. It was because he honestly believed these things that he would, with his whole heart, vote against the Bill.

*MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.) said he had listened with great satisfaction to the moderate speech of the Leader of the Nationalist Party. Personally he looked upon the breakdown of the Act as a temporary phase, and he agreed that in dealing with any measure of the magnitude of the Land Act time and fair play must be given before judging the results; He for one had never expected complete and immediate results from a Land Purchase Act which necessarily contained many ramifications and was intended to apply to all time. He entirely agreed with the hon. and learned Member for Waterford also, that so far as the question of the untenanted land was concerned, so far as the evicted tenants were concerned, and so far as the question of the enlargement of the holdings was concerned—and these were very large items indeed—there had been a temporary breakdown, giving room for the gravest disappointment and for resolute action on the part of the Government, and of that House, if necessary. The breakdown, as regarded all three points, was largely owing to the decision of Mr. Justice Ross on the question of the bonus; that in his opinion was a most unfortunate decision. Of course, the Estates Commissioners now could not buy untenanted land without being ready to pay the bonus and Mr. Justice Ross had the satisfaction of having practically arrested one of the most philanthropic and beneficent parts of the whole Act. It was because he saw in the Bill a peremptory method of reversing that decision and allowing the Act to have free course that he welcomed a debate on the whole question. Those of them who had been in the House ever since the first Land Purchase Act came into operation and could look back, for instance, to the Act of 1885, were aware that during nineteen years, as the result of the Acts, £22,000,000 had been spent on land purchase in Ireland. The present Land Act had been in operation for eight months, and they heard from the Chief Secretary that applications to the extent of £8,000,000 had already been before the Estates Commissioners. It was perfectly impossible for land reformers in Ireland or out of it to ignore that fact, and in his opinion it gave promise of a great future for this question. [A NATIONALIST MEMBER: What about the prices?] He did not think this was a debate on which Members ought to speak without forethought, and hopes should not be raised or dashed by their discussion. The issues were much too serious for that. They had not only had the facts he had mentioned from the Chief Secretary but they had had the other fact that negotiations were going on all over the country, and estates coming in to the Commissioners every day in large numbers, which also gave them a ground for hope.

Now he came to the question of the prices, and he was exceedingly glad to see the hon. Member for North Antrim in his place, for he had something to say in regard to that Gentleman's negotiations with his tenants. So far as second-term rents were concerned the average price paid under what was known as Wyndham's Act was twenty-three-and-a-half years purchase. That was the average price as shown by the returns which had come in, and he was prepared to tell any one to close with 20 per cent. reduction in addition to the reduction of 38 per cent. already effected, for he had consistently told his constituents in Ulster that such terms could not be deemed to be a bad bargain. The real difficulty was not here, but with respect to first-term rents and non-judicial tenancies. Landlords had made hay of the Act so far as those tenancies were concerned. The Land Conference had been assailed, but he believed no body of men ever did a better day's work for Ireland. The Conference proposed a certain reduction on second-term rents, with a fair equivalent for first-term rents and non-judicial tenancies. Instead of giving that, the landlords were doing nothing of the kind, first-term rents bringing much too high a price when compared with second-term rents, and as to non-judicial tenancies the terms were simply enormous. He was going to give an illustration of this from a letter written by the hon. and learned Member for North Antrim.

MR. WILLIAM MOORE said that was a private letter to a friend and not to a tenant. Although he could not prevent his friend reading it in the House, if he thought that was fair and honourable, if the hon. Member did so he must take the consequences in his own constituency.

*MR. T. W. RUSSELL said he would take any consequences in his own constituency or anywhere else. He would not read the hon. and learned Member's letter, however, but he would read the tenant's letter to the hon. and learned Member, which was not private and which the tenant had forwarded to him.

MR. WILLIAM MOORE: The letter I got from this gentleman was marked "private" and the answer also was private. It should be treated as confidential, and there was no right to show it to any one. If the letter was read he would ask leave to make a personal explanation.

*MR. T. W. RUSSELL then read the letter, dated 1st December, 1903, in which the writer said, having seen a letter of the hon. Member for North Antrim in which it was stated that he considered twenty years purchase fair, "I cannot understand on what grounds you have increased your estimate so much as to ask almost twenty-eight years, exclusive of the bonus." The hon. and learned Gentleman was typical of landlords all over the country. That they should have been willing to accept twenty years purchase before the Act was passed and now asked twenty-eight years exclusive of the bonus, was a gross abuse of the Parliamentary grant. This was a matter which English Members would do well to consider. After all it was their money which was being dealt with in this way. Yet this was what was going on all over the country, and it was this that he strongly objected to. The landlords under the circumstances had no right to exact such terms.

There was another point. The hon. and learned Member for Waterford had indicated that before much time had elapsed the principle of compulsion must be brought into play and that, so far as certain districts were concerned, it would be impossible to get the untenanted lands into the operation of the Act without compulsory powers. With that he agreed and, indeed, he held that compulsory powers should have been introduced into the Bill itself. What was going on, especially in the province of Ulster? A considerable number of sales were at present going forward, and he was much more hopeful than before because he was happy to think that the tenants were not being led to give too high prices. Those on the largest estate in South Tyrone had absolutely refused to give the landlord what they thought to be an unfair price. There were in Ulster, for instance, a very considerable number of landlords who would not sell at any price. It might be asked why they should be compelled to do so. Because it was the evident intention of the Government in passing last year's Act to make it a measure of national appeasement based upon broad grounds of national policy and upon the assumption that it was desirable for the land of Ireland to pass from owner to occupier. This was a landlords' Bill in the sense that it would secure to the landlord what the Land Act of 1903 attempted to secure for him, but it was more than a landlords' Bill, because if it were not passed it would be impossible to sell the land, and he, therefore, hoped it would be passed. He still believed that if the Irish land question were settled the principal difficulty would be removed from the path of Irish progress. He did not doubt that in many cases too much would be paid for the land and tenants would be taken in by wily and crafty agents, but he looked upon the Land Act of last year as an instrument of a great appeasement of the Irish difficulty. It was not a question with him as to the actual market value of the land, but a question of getting a great settlement of this question and clearing the way for other things almost as important.

MR. WILLIAM MOORE said he desired to make a personal explanation. He had only just heard in the lobby that the hon. Member for South Tyrone was going to raise a personal matter concerning himself. Had he known earlier he would have provided himself with the correspondence. The letter which the hon. Member had referred to was not addressed to a tenant of his (Mr. Moore) though it was true that the gentleman addressed was the minister of one tenant. It was a private letter. It contained an offer, which was never accepted, good or bad. He heard a year afterwards that the letter had been shown and he wrote protesting. He considered the whole transaction closed and had forgotten the letter was written, while the tenant had attended a meeting at which an offer was made of twenty-two years purchase. He had seen a letter from the minister since, and he then recognised an attempt by this gentleman to force him into giving him better terms than his neighbours. Nine-tenths of his tenants had accepted his terms as fair. He was determined, whatever it cost him, not to be driven. This gentleman would get the same terms as the others and no better.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover) said he was responsible for the introduction of the Bill, which only purported to give effect to the intentions of the Legislature last year. It was true that if the Bill were not passed the Land Purchase Act would be hung up and blame would be placed upon the House of Commons. He believed the Act was working well, but he was perfectly certain it could not continue to act unless this Bill were passed. The Act of last year did not embody all the resolutions of the Land Conference, but the interests of the two parties interested had been fairly well preserved. Both were shorn of some of their advantages, but the arrangements under the Act were in the main those arrived at by the Land Conference. The hon. and learned Member for Waterford had protested against the form of the Bill because, in his opinion, it precluded him at later stages from raising the question of compulsory purchase. If the Bill had been drafted in any other form, looking at the state of Parliamentary business, it would not be possible to pass it this session. The hon. and learned Member for Waterford had misconstrued an observation he had made the previous day with regard to the Congested Districts Board. He (Mr. Wyndham) said that the Congested Districts Board had been able to buy untenanted land, although the Estates Commissioners had not, but he did not say they had been able to buy as much untenanted land as they might otherwise have bought. Their income was limited, and they had gone as far as it was safe to go in the direction of purchasing land without the assistance of the bonus in respect of untenanted land. In that respect alone the Act of last year had made a great difference. From the year 1888 to 1903, fifteen years, the total amount of money expended by the Congested Districts Board in the purchase of land was only £441,000, whereas in the nine months since the passing of the Act they had almost concluded purchases amounting to £545,000.

The difficulty was not that landlords in the West of Ireland were unwilling to sell untenanted land. He did not think they would get land cheaper or quicker if they acquired it by compulsory means. It would be most inexpedient to introduce compulsory powers of purchase in congested districts. When they were dealing with people who were willing to sell it would not assist the matter to threaten to take the land by force. Apart from that, it would take longer to put compulsory powers in force. What was often described as a refusal on the part of the landlord to sell really meant that the transaction was a complicated one, and it was found an uncommonly difficult thing to bring back the evicted tenants. In such cases, he thought it was the better course for the whole estate to be sold to the Estates Commissioners, and for them to take the responsibility of dividing the untenanted land. It had been suggested that Lord Lansdowne opposed the provisions of the Act for the reinstatement of the evicted tenants; but Lord Lansdowne did more perhaps in the House of Lords than anyone to get these provisions carried as an element in the compromise. There was another element of the compromise, and that was that no pressure, direct or indirect, was to be brought to bear upon any person occupying a farm from which others had been evicted. He knew of no case of a landlord having proceeded for a hanging gale, but such a case would, in his opinion, involve a departure from the spirit of the Land Conference. On the other hand, he had heard that in some cases tenants had suddenly ceased to pay rent, or required a large reduction, coupled with other terms. Either of those departures from the spirit of the Land Conference was to be deplored, deprecated, and reprobated by those who trusted to the Act of last year was a solution of the land question. He had been asked whether the Estates Commissioners had power to buy the interest of farmers occupying holdings from which tenants had been evicted. He thought they had.

MR. KILBRIDE: Will the right hon. Gentleman say what initiative the Estates Commissioners take?

MR. WYNDHAM: The question of initiative is a question of fact and expediency. As I said before, it is not my intention to make a long speech upon this occasion. This Bill is only intended to confirm the decision at which Parliament arrived last year, and, if it is not passed, the whole of the operations of the Act of last year will, I fear, be largely impeded in the future, almost arrested, more particularly in respect of remedying congestion and of restoring evicted tenants to their holdings.

MR. T. M. HEALY said he had listened to the debate with much sympathy, but with some sadness. The Irish land question since the Act of 1881 had pursued a sort of normal course. They had endeavoured to improve Mr. Gladstone's legislation, and side by side with that they had endeavoured to improve the position of the tenant. That debate, however, seemed to him to have entirely ignored in many respects the basis on which the legislation of last year proceeded, and, to a certain extent, to give the go-by to Mr. Gladstone's legislation. The Amendment was put before the House as having the warranty of a National Convention. Let them contrast the terms in which it was proposed, however moderate, and some of the speeches which had been made in support of it, with the manner in which the Land Act was received by the responsible Members of the Irish Party in their organisation in September last year. He had just been out and got the resolution which hailed the passing of the Act which was now being criticised, and which was passed at a meeting presided over by the hon. and learned Member for Waterford and attended by twenty-one of his colleagues, some of whom had spoken in the House to-day. He was not finding fault with the speeches; he thought that there was great ground for the disappointment that had been expressed. But he would remind them of the resolution passed on 8th September, 1903, at a meeting of the National Convention, presided over by the hon. Member for Waterford, which was as follows—

> "That we welcome in the new Land Act the most substantial victory gained for centuries by the Irish race for the reconquest of the soil of Ireland by the people, and the disbanding of the alien garrison which has been hitherto employed by England for the maintenance of a pernicious and irresponsible class ascendency, and we look to the successful working of the new measure for the creation of a new state of things in which all Irishmen, irrespective of class or creed, will have a hand in labouring unitedly for the national rights and happiness of our country."

Here was another resolution—

> "That, while the Act, as placed on the Statute-book, falls short in various important particulars of the recommendations of the Land Conference and the requirements of the national demand for the extinction of landlordism within a reasonable time, we cordially recognise that the Amendments demanded by the National Convention have been conceded in Committee to an extent to which no Government measure in relation to Ireland has ever before been modified in deference to the demands of Irish Nationalist opinion."

That was a recognition of the action of the House of Commons such as he had never known before on the part of any Irish Nationalist organisation.

> "We think it a duty to make a free acknowledgment that, next to the exertions of the United Irish Party, under the leadership of Mr. Redmond and Mr. T. W. Russell, the happiest result is to be traced to the wisdom and active good will displayed by that section of the landlord leaders which made the Land Conference possible, to the loyalty with which Mr. Wyndham, and his associates in the Government of Ireland, endeavoured to make good his pledges to give legislative effect to the wishes of the Conference, as well as to the high public spirit with which the Liberal Party resisted the temptation to extract any Party advantage from the situation."

That was butter all round. That was the orthodoxy of September last, but what was the orthodoxy of July? Let them contrast the orthodoxy of September last with the orthodoxy of July, as voiced in this Amendment. What had brought about the change? When an Irish National Convention was given as the warranty for this Amendment, he could not forget that he had the honour to stand alone in that House in consequence of the mandate of a National Convention which expelled him from the Irish Party. In consequence of what had happened, he sincerely thanked that Convention. In his judgment, if he had been present in the Irish Party for the last three or four years, he should have saved the Irish farmers £20,000,000. [NATIONALIST cries of "No, no!"]

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): What about the Morley property?

MR. T. M. HEALY said the Resolution proposed by the hon. and learned Member for Waterford declared—

> "That no measure dealing with the Amendment of the Irish Land Act of 1903 can be accepted as satisfactory which deals only with facilitating Irish landlords in obtaining the bonus, and which provides no remedy for the grave defects of that Act affecting Irish

tenants, particularly the creation of a system of zones leading to the unjust inflation of prices."

The system of zones, of which they now heard in the Amendment, was never heard of until the Land Conference made its report—never mentioned in Irish politics; yet it was on account of that system of zones, invented by the signatories of the Conference, that he was asked to vote against this Bill. He declined to do so; he intended to vote for this Bill, and he would tell the House why. He disliked the system of bonus, and believed it was working, so far as the Land Judge's Court was concerned, to the enormous enhancement of their property. He intended, therefore, when this Bill reached Committee, to endeavour to provide that no landlord selling his estate in Judge Ross's Court should get any bonus whatever. He thought that was the true solution of the enormous inflation of prices which had taken place. Hon. Members came forward there who were themselves taking their property out of Judge Ross's Court, where it would have been sold, under the 40th section, for eighteen years purchase—[Nationalist cries of "Order"]—instead of twenty-four-and-a-half. [Interruption.] He would like to know why the hon. Member for Kildare was not interrupted when he talked about headlines. Those Gentlemen who interrupted him evidently did not like that mention of twenty-four-and-a-half years purchase, yet these (pointing to his colleagues) were the Gentlemen who moved and supported the Amendment. ["Order."] It was the hon. Member for Waterford who had set a headline to the landlords of Ireland in asking twenty-four-and-a-half years purchase. ["Order."] He hoped Irish tenants would take note. [Loud cries of "Order."]

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! I did not interrupt the hon. Member, because he has said nothing out of order. Anything short of that hon. Members should allow him to say.

Mr. T. M. HEALY, who was greeted with renewed Nationalist cries of "Order, order!" said that in spite of the efforts of his colleagues to prevent him, he should say what he liked.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): You will not say what you like here.

Mr. T. M. Healy.

Mr. T. M. HEALY, proceeding, said he attributed and ascribed to these Gentlemen in the House of Commons——

Mr. LUNDON: Who sold the Morley property for twenty-seven years purchase? [Nationalist interruptions and cries of "Answer that."]

Mr. T. M. HEALY suggested that a Select Committee should be appointed to inquire into this matter of how the Morley property was sold and how the Redmond property was sold. He should be quite prepared to defend his action before such a Committee, and the hon. and learned Member for Waterford could do the same. He had no fear as to the result, as far as he was concerned. Having dealt with this betrayal of the Irish Party—[Cries of "Order" and "Withdraw 'Betrayal.'"]

Mr. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, there is an organised attempt to prevent the hon. Member from being heard. [Interruption.]

*Mr. SPEAKER: I have called upon hon. Members to listen to the observations made by the hon. Member with courtesy, however heartily they may disagree with them. It is the duty of Members of this House to do so—a duty which hon. Members on the Irish Benches themselves always try to exact from hon. Members sitting opposite.

Mr. T. M. HEALY, whose remarks were almost inaudible owing to disorderly shouts from the Irish Benches, was understood to say that the policy adopted by the Irish Party would increase the rates and taxes in Ireland, and he was satisfied that it was only by a system of adequately taxing grass lands that this inflation of land values could be effectively prevented. The question of the grass lands in the West of Ireland was one which required immediate attention. He foresaw that whether it was done by this Government or some succeeding Government some attempt would have to be made to deal with the grass lands in Ireland. He strongly resented the action of hon. Members who, while condemning the exorbitant demands made on behalf of the owners of estates in Ireland in regard to the sale of their land, themselves approved and accepted high prices for their own land. [Renewed disorderly interruptions from the IRISH Benches and MINISTERIAL cries of "Order, order!"] One remedy for this difficulty could be found by the imposition of an adequate system of local taxation. [NATIONALIST cries of "Divide, divide."] In addition to that he held the opinion that an adequate stamp duty should be placed upon ejectments and notices to quit. He thought it was a monstrous thing that while a tenant had to pay from £2 to £3 on going into the Land Court a landlord should be able to obtain a notice to quit and only have to pay half-a-crown for the stamp duty. He was of opinion, therefore, that one of the most effective methods of dealing with the agrarian problem in the future would be by means of fiscal proposals in the Budget Bill. It was only by that means that they could ever hope to bring adequate pressure to bear on the landowners in Ireland. In the past the landlords had only been able to obtain from seventeen to eighteen years purchase and now the Nationalist Party were approving of twenty-four-and-a-half years purchase. [A NATIONALIST MEMBER: You will get a job after this, and cries of "You will get a judgeship," and "Judge Healy."] By adopting this course Nationalist Members had befooled their country and betrayed the Irish Party.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Why do not you go on the other side?

MR. T. M. HEALY said he had used exactly the same language before his constituency, and he should not shrink from repeating it in the House of Commons.

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): Why do not you go to Ireland and say that?

MR. T. M. HEALY again addressed the House, but from this point the remainder of the hon. Member's speech was rendered nearly inaudible by disorderly cries from the Nationalist Benches, such as "Traitor," "Dublin Castle," "Omagh," and "Coward."

COLONEL SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.) in supporting the Bill, said the debate had ended in a manifestation which illustrated the justice of their objection to an Irish Home Rule Parliament.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 203; Noes, 90. (Division List No. 215.)

AYES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Bowles, Lt.-Col. H.F(Middlesex
Bowles, T.Gibson (King's Lynn
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J.A.(Glasgow
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn.J.A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hn. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Rt.Hn.Sir John C. R.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Davenport, William Bromley
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt.Hn.Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt.Hn.Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants., W.
Fergusson, Rt.Hn.Sir J.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gordon, Hn.J E.(Elgin & Nairn)
Gore, Hon. S.F.Ormsby-(Linc.)
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E.W(B'rySEdm'nds
Greene, Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gunter, Sir Robert
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Healy, Timothy Michael
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heaton, John Henniker

Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt.Hon. Arthur Fred.
Kerr, John
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant(Yorks.N.R
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Majendie, James A. H.
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, W.J.H (Dumfriesshire
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt.Hn.A.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Saunderson, Rt.Hn.Col.Edw.J.
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H. (Renfrew)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich.
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas.(Somerset)
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thompson, Dr.E.C(Monagh'n, N
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wills, Sir Frederick
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H.(Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wood, James
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Ambrose, Robert
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Burke, E. Haviland
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Channing, Francis Allston
Clancy, John Joseph
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Delany, William
Devlin, Charles Ramsay(Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Field, William
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P.(Cavan, W.)
Kilbride, Denis
Labouchere, Henry
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Leamy, Edmund
Leese, Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Mooney, John J.
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, William
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Stevenson, Francis S.
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Tomkinson, James
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.

Main Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 199; Noes, 82. (Division List No. 216.)

AYES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H.
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Worc
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Rt. Hon. Sir John C. R.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E. W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gunter, Sir Robert
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Healy, Timothy Michael
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Kerr, John
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks. N. R
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Majendie, James A. H.
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, W. J. H (Dumfriesshire
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir Frederick G.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moore, William
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Doherty, William
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick George
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J.
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H. (Renfrew)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thompson, Dr E. C (Monagh'n, N
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wills, Sir Frederick
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wood, James
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ambrose, Robert
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Burke, E. Haviland
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Channing, Francis Allston
Clancy, John Joseph
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Delany, William
Devlin,CharlesRamsay(Galw'y
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Field, William
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy,Vincent P.(Cavan,W.
Kilbride, Denis
Labouchere, Henry
Law, Hugh, Alex.(Donegal,W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Leamy, Edmund
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Lewis, John Herbert
Lundon, W.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Mooney, John J.
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien,Kendal (TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor,James (Wicklow,W.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
Power, Patrick Joseph
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Stevenson, Francis S.
Sullivan, Donal
Tomkinson, James
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.

Bill accordingly read a second time, and committed for Thursday next.

SAVINGS BANKS ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Amendment proposed [17th June] to the Bill on Consideration, as amended (by the Standing Committee).

Which Amendment was—

"In page 1, line 21, to leave out Clause 3."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Question again proposed, "That the words of the clause to the end of line 24, page 1, stand part of the Bill."

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Other Amendments made to the Bill.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

THE LICENSING BILL.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Sir A. ACLAND-HOOD, Somersetshire, Wellington), in moving the adjournment of the House, announced that the Committee on the Licensing Bill would be the First Order on Monday, and that Monday would be the second allotted day.

CHINESE COOLIES IN THE TRANSVAAL.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.) asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether it was true, as stated in a telegram published that morning, that two coolies had escaped from the compound at Johannesburg, were captured at Pretoria, and bought back in custody; was it true that those men had tried to escape only a few hours after they had landed and had been placed in such favourable conditions as the right hon. Gentleman had described in his speeches; also what was the meaning of the word "captured"? It seemed a curious word in connection with indentured labourers.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. LYTTELTON, Warwick and Leamington): I have no information on the subject.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: You ought to have information. [Laughter and cries of "Order."]

MR. LYTTELTON: Neither do I consider it convenient that I should be asked to express my views about the terms of a telegram of which I have no knowledge.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Will you telegraph to Lord Milner?

MR. LYTTELTON: No, I do not think it necessary.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: That is just what I wanted you to say.

Adjourned at four minutes before Six o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 11th July, 1904.

CHARLES HENRY DUKE OF GORDON.

Was (in the usual manner) introduced by virtue of Letters Patent, dated the 13th day of January, 1876, his father, the Duke (Duke of Richmond in the Peerage of England), who was created by such Patent, never having taken his seat as Duke of Gordon.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

London United Tramways Bill. The King's consent signified; and Bill reported, with Amendments.

Southport and Lytham Tramroad (Extension of Time) Bill [H.L.]. Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Clyde Navigation (Works) Bill. Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, the opposition thereto having been withdrawn; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The orders made on Tuesday the 28th and Thursday the 30th of June last discharged, and Bill committed.

Swindon Corporation Bill. Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, the opposition thereto having been withdrawn; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The orders made on Tuesday, the 28th and Thursday the 30th of June last discharged and Bill committed for Thursday next.

City of London (Central Criminal Court House) Bill. Read 3^a, and passed.

Charing Cross, Euston, and Hampstead Railway Bill. Read 3^a, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Savings Banks Acts Amendment Bill. Brought from the Commons.

Loch Leven Water Power Bill. Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; and referred to the Examiners.

Airdrie Corporation Gas Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Wishaw Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to.

Belfast and North-East Ireland Electricity and Power Gas Bill [H.L.]. Reported, with Amendments.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]; Water Works Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. Read 3^a (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Education Board Provisional Order (Cardiff) Bill. Read 3^a (according to order), and passed.

Filey Improvement Bill [H.L.]; Maidenhead Bridge Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Great Central Railway Bill; London County Council (Money) Bill; Plymouth Corporation Bill; Wolverhampton Corporation Bill. Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

Strabane, Raphoe, and Convoy Railway Bill. Message from the Commons giving leave to the right hon. George Wyndham, a Member, to attend the Select Committee (pursuant to message of Friday last).

PETITIONS.

SUPPLY OF ELECTRICITY BILL [H.L.].

Petition to be heard by counsel against; of Corporation of Hackney; read, and ordered to lie upon the Table.

OUTDOOR RELIEF (FRIENDLY SOCIETIES) BILL [H.L.].

Petition against; of Guardians of the Poor of Bedford Union; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION: ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (DEFECTIVE AND EPILEPTIC CHILDREN).

Regulations of the Board of Education, dated 11th July, 1904, providing for grants on account of the education of defective and epileptic children, and

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

prescribing conditions to be fulfilled by certified schools and classes for such children.

AFRICA, No. 8 (1904).

Correspondence relating to the resignation of Sir Charles Eliot and to the concession to the East Africa Syndicate.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Orders made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade—

Authorising construction of light railways in the city of Ripon, and in the rural district of Ripon, in the West Riding of the county of York.

Authorising construction of a light railway from Witney, in the county of Oxford, to Andoversford, in the county of Gloucester.

Authorising construction of light railways in the county of Essex, in the borough of Southend-on-Sea, and the urban district of Shoeburyness.

Amending the Leek, Caldon Low, and Hartington Light Railways Order, 1898.

Transferring to the mayor, aldermen, and burgesses of the borough of Lowestoft the powers conferred upon the East Anglian Light Railways Company by the East Anglican Light Railways Order, 1902, and amending that Order.

WHALING AND WHALE-CURING (SCOTLAND).

Report of a Departmental Committee appointed by the Secretary for Scotland to inquire into the new whaling and whale-curing industry on the coast of Scotland, and in the adjacent waters. Volume II. Minutes of Evidence and Appendix.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

LUNACY.

Appendix to Fifty-eighth Report of the Commissioners in Lunacy, presented 29th June, 1904.

SUPERANNUATION.

Treasury Minute, dated 7th July, 1904, declaring that Thomas Galler, skilled labourer, Royal Laboratory, War Office, was appointed without a Civil Service certificate through inadvertence on the part of the head of his Department.

POST OFFICE (FOREIGN AND COLONIAL PARCEL POST).

Statutory Rules and Orders, 1904. No. 1076.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

SAVINGS BANKS ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

Read 1^a; and to be printed. (No. 139.)

POLICE CONSTABLE ANDERSON.

EARL CADOGAN: My Lords, I beg to give notice that I propose to-morrow to ask His Majesty's Government whether they will lay on the Table of the House any Papers or correspondence which it may be in their opinion right to lay, on the subject of Police-Constable Anderson, of the Royal Irish Constabulary. May I also add that it is not my intention to raise any discussion upon that notice, but I think that, inasmuch as the information which we have received is entirely unauthentic, it is desirable that such Papers as are available should be laid on the Table of the House.

THE MILITIA.

***THE EARL OF WEMYSS**: My Lords, I hope that the reasonableness of the Motion I have placed on the Notice Paper and the necessity for what it proposes will induce your Lordships to give it favourable consideration. My Motion reads: "To move to resolve, That this House, while reaffirming the Resolution passed by the Lords in 1883, 'That having regard to the present defective military organisation, and to the great importance of the Militia Force, it is essential that the Militia should be forthwith recruited up to its established strength,' is further of opinion that so long as the Militia continues to be, as it now is, the constitutional basis of our existing military system, it should be so raised as not to compete for voluntary recruits, as it now does, with the Regular Army to the great detriment of the military forces of the Crown." Your Lordships will observe that the first part of the Motion is an historical statement of what passed in 1883, but it does not say that the Resolution which is quoted here was carried in the teeth of the combined opposition of the two Front Benches. It was carried, my Lords, by the independent, patriotic action of your Lordships, to which again, under like circumstances, I intend to appeal. The latter part of my Motion says that the Militia is the constitutional basis of our existing military system ?

Now what is our existing military system ? It is a system which is, I think, absolutely perfect, having regard to our insular position. It is this, that you have an Army raised by voluntary enlistment which is ready to go anywhere and everywhere out of the United Kingdom where wanted and, on the other hand, you have a Militia which is raised by compulsion—that is the history of the Militia; raised properly by compulsion—for home service, and for home service alone. That Militia is capable, though raised only for home defence, of volunteering as regiments for foreign service, or the men may individually go into the Army. The third element of our military system is the Volunteer Force, and that force originally consisted of those who volunteered rather than run the chance of the Militia ballot. I need not tell your Lordships that the existing system is not enforced, that the foundation and basis of it, a Militia raised by compulsion, is a dead letter. It is not so raised. The foundation of our military system is every year broken up by a special Act which suspends the ballot for the Militia.

Now, my Lords, what is the state of the Militia ? In 1883, when your Lordships passed the Resolution I have read, the state of the Militia was as follows:—Establishment, 128,069; enrolled, 104,431; wanting, 23,638; under nineteen, 15,904; struck off as absent, 6,904; Army Militia Reserve, 26,692; a further reduction of one-fifth for casualties and artillery, left infantry, rank and file, above nineteen years of age, 36,638. The state of things on the whole has been the same throughout - there has always been a deficiency in the Militia of from 20,000 to 30,000 men. And why, my Lords ? Because, as I have said, the foundation and basis of our military system is annually broken up.

What is the conclusion come to on this question by the Duke of Norfolk's Commission, who were appointed to inquire into the organisation, numbers, and terms of service of our Militia and Volunteer Forces, and to report whether any, and if any, what changes are required in order to secure that these forces shall be maintained in a condition of military efficiency and at an adequate strength ? The conclusion they have come to is that it is through compulsion, and compulsion alone, that you can get a satisfactory Force for home defence. Thus, in concluding their Report they say that—

> "A home defence army capable, in the absence of the Regular Forces, of protecting the country against invasion can be raised and maintained only on the principle that it is the duty of every citizen of military age to be trained for the national defence and take a part in it should emergency arise."

I would personally thank the noble Duke and his colleagues who sat on the Commission for the splendid courage they showed in bringing up this recommendation. They have been accussed of exceeding the terms of the Warrant under which they were appointed, but they did nothing of the kind. They found in the course of their inquiry that everything was unsatisfactory, that it was not a case of doing this or that little thing to bring the force to a condition of military efficiency and adequate strength, but that the whole basis was wrong, and they had the courage to say so. They deserve our thanks for putting forward the view which I think to be the right view, and for having the courage to tell the nation the truth.

The Report of the Commission has been received in a way that is not to the credit of this country. It has been universally abused, and if anybody wants to know what was said about it they have only to read a most interesting article in the *Nineteenth Century and After* by a great military critic, but not a politician—Colonel Lonsdale Hale. The title of his article is "Our Pitiable Military Situation," and in it he shows how unjust has been the action and the language used towards the Duke of Norfolk's Commission. This brings me to the question of compulsory service. In the opinion of the Duke of Norfolk's Commission it is only thus that our military forces can be put on a right foundation, but, as I have said, this is denounced in every possible way, and by no one has this question of compulsory service been so strongly denounced as by an old brother officer of mine, Colonel Sir Howard Vincent, in a letter in *The Times.*

Colonel Sir Howard Vincent had the audacity—there is no other word fully expressing it, and it is a word I have used to his face—to say that all those who are in favour of compulsory service are foolish persons. I naturally wrote to *The Times*, asking my friend to name these foolish persons. He declined to answer my letter, and as far as he is concerned, these foolish persons are unnamed. But I thought it right to endeavour to find out, as far as I could, who these foolish persons were, and I hold in my hand a list containing their names. I begin in 1804 with Mr. Fox and Mr. Pitt; Then comes Lord Sidmouth in 1807; Sir James Graham's Committee on Army Organisation in 1860; The Duke of Wellington, Lord Palmerston, and the Recruiting Commission in 1867; Lord Dalhousie in 1867; Lord Longford in 1867; Sir James Scarlett in 1870; Mr. Cardwell in 1871; Earl Russell in 1871; Lord Sandhurst in 1871; and the last authority is the noble Marquessthe present Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. The noble Marquess in 1900 introduced a Bill to bring the Militia ballot up to date, but it is lying derelict, a dead letter, and we were told by the late Under-Secretary of State for War that it would require some sixty or seventy more clauses to make it work. These are some of the "foolish persons" referred to by Sir Howard Vincent. But you have besides that, the evidence given before the Duke of Norfolk's Commission, and I think my noble friend, Lord Newton, did good service in writing to *The Times*, giving a summary of the names and evidence of the witnesses who were in favour of compulsory service. The names were Sir T. Kelly-Kenny, Earl Roberts, Viscount Wolseley, Sir John French, Sir John Ardagh, Lord Castletown, Sir Evelyn Wood, Sir H. Hildyard, and Sir William Parr; and among others were Lord Raglan, a former Under-Secretary of State for War who is opposed to the ballot, but is one of those who are in favour of compulsory service. In addition compulsory service is supported by eminent business men, employers of labour, Volunteer officers, and others. I think it would be as well at this stage that I should read to the House the names of the members of the Norfolk Commission. The Commission was composed as follows:—The Duke of Norfolk, Chairman; The Duke of Richmond and Gordon, the Earl of Derby (a former Secretary of State for War), Lord Grenfell, Sir Coleridge Grove, Sir Ralph Henry Knox, Colonel George O'Callaghan-Westropp, Colonel Evan H. Llewellyn, Colonel E. Satterthwaite, Colonel James A. Dalmahoy, and Mr. Henry Spenser Wilkinson

The Earl of Wemyss.

Now, my Lords, with such evidence as is before them, and knowing as the Government do that all their difficulties as regards the Army would disappear if they only had the courage to enforce the existing law, why is it that they do not enforce it? There are two reasons—first the existence of the Navy; and, secondly, what is more important still, the existence of the voter. The idea of what is called the "blue water school," is that if you have a powerful Navy you want nothing more; that you may be subject to small raids, but not to serious invasion. I hold in my hand a quotation giving the views of Mr. Pitt on this very point a century ago, for there were also at that time men who held the view of the blue water school. Mr. Pitt abused the Government for their insufficient action, and proceeded—

> "What, then, are we to think of Ministers who, with such an opportunity of observation, overlooked renewing the ballot for that important part of our force, the Militia, during peace."

Could anything, my Lords, after a hundred years be more applicable than that to the state of things existing to-day? Then Mr. Pitt went on to speak of Bonaparte's preparations for invasion and of our 184,000 men in the Army and 400,000 Volunteers and our naval means — Nelson was then alive — as being insufficient for our defence. I turn from Mr. Pitt to what was said by

Lord Wolseley one hundred years later before the Duke of Norfolk's Commission. Lord Wolseley said—

> "I think it would be living in a fool's paradise were the English people to depend exclusively on the Navy for the defence of this country from invasion."

Later on Lord Wolseley said —

> "To depend upon the Navy alone for the defence of this country, and to forego having an Army on that account, would be the madness we are told in ancient writings the gods used to send to those whom they wished to destroy. Those who believe and preach that, preach what is the most injurious doctrine the English people could hear."

The same language was used by Lord Palmerston, who stated that the men who thought we could rely, even in this nautical country, upon the Navy alone for home defence were simply mad; and I doubt not that if now alive he would call the "Blue Water" school the "Blue Bedlamites." So much for this question in the past.

I asked the noble Earl the First Lord of the Admiralty two years ago whether he thought we could trust to the Navy alone for defence, and he replied that I had put a conundrum to him that it would take all the debating societies in England two or three years to answer. When I saw the name of the noble Earl among those who had given evidence before the Duke of Norfolk's Commission, I thought I should find an answer to that question; but, from first to last, there was not a single question put to the First Lord as to the Navy. He spoke as a Colonel of Militia, and not as First Lord. I quite understand why the Commission did not put any questions to the noble Earl with regard to the Navy. It was because when they asked for evidence from the Admiralty it was denied them, and in the same way evidence was denied them from the Defence Committee. Therefore, we get nothing from the First Lord of the Admiralty with reference to the efficiency of the Navy on this point. As I have said, Lord Wolseley agrees with Lord Palmerston and others that those men are mad who think we can trust to the Navy alone.

It is always said that the people of this country would not stand the foreign form of conscription. No one asks them to stand it. All that is asked for is that the English system of raising Militia in this country which is already on the Statute-book may be put in force. Nobody asks for more. I hold that the language that is used is a libel—nothing less—on our nation. When you want it, and think it is of use, you then speak and boast, as you did in the days of the late war, of the patriotism of the people; you then went down on your knees, with 5s. a day in your hand, to men who had never been across a horse, and asked them to become Yeomen, and many of them did and performed excellent service. Therefore, when it suits you, you trade upon their patriotism, but when it does not suit you and you think you run the danger of losing votes by doing your duty, you abstain from doing it and say that the people would not stand compulsory service for home defence. I maintain that that is a libel on the people of our country, and I want to know on what authority those who make that statement base it.

For the last forty years I have spoken in favour of compulsory service everywhere, and I have never heard a whisper of dissent. Further, I tested the feelings of the country in a way that cannot be denied. I sent out two year ago a circular, on the one hand to Lords-Lieutenant of counties, chairmen of county councils, chairmen of quarter sessions, chairmen of chambers of agriculture, chairmen of chambers of commerce, and, on the other hand, to mayors, provosts, and chief magistrates of cities and burghs. I may say that 400 circulars went out, and between 200 and 300 replies were received. The questions I put were (1) Whether, in their opinion, the present state of our home defence was satisfactory and reliable? To which question 75 per cent. replied "No;" and (2) Whether in their opinion the nation would, for home defence only, accept a modified form of compulsory service? To which question two to one answered "Yes." From those replies I am justified in declaring that the statement that the people of this country are so unpatriotic as to refuse to accept compulsory service, when told it is necessary, is a libel on the nation.

When I was examined before the Duke of Norfolk's Commission I was asked by Sir Ralph Knox, an old friend of mine—

> "But would not what you propose be unpopular?"

Do not forget, my Lords, that he was one of the Commissioners who signed the Report in favour of compulsory service. Indeed, the general principle that there should be compulsory service was agreed upon unanimously by the Commissioners. My answer to him was—

> "It does not matter whether it is popular or unpopular; if it is right it should be done."

During sixty-two years of public life I have never known a Government come forward on their own responsibility and ask either for money or for men or whatever was required for the safety of the nation and be refused what they asked. We are on the eve of an utterance in another place from the Secretary of State for War as to what this recondite Army reform measure is on which there has been so much dispute, and we are to begin this last form of reform as late as 14th July, when the session has nearly gone. I know that His Majesty's Government are not going to have anything in the shape of compulsory service, because when I was asked if I would put this Motion off I said that if the Government would give me an assurance that compulsory service formed part of the new scheme I——

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The Earl of DONOUGHMORE): The noble Earl's request was for an assurance that the ballot formed part of the new scheme.

*THE EARL OF WEMYSS: The noble Earl thinks, perhaps, that the ballot is more severe than compulsory service.

*THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: I think it different.

*THE EARL OF WEMYSS: The ballot is an alleviation of it. In foreign countries the whole nation is liable to conscription, but we do not require that. But, at any rate, I am assured that compulsion in no form constitutes part of the Government measure. I am inclined to think, however, that there must be something in what we hear about the reduction of the forces, Militia and others, for on 28th June the Secretary of State for War and the Prime Minister both showed that they had been nobbled, captured, got hold of, by the blue water school of thought. They spoke in favour of money being given to the Navy rather than spent on our land forces. And it looks to me as if there is some truth, too, in the statement that this scheme, whatever it may be, does not meet with the approval of non-political experts. I hold in my hand an extract from a speech by Sir Neville Lyttelton, who, as your Lordships know full well, is the military adviser to and the first military officer on the Defence Committee, of which, I think very wrongly, the Prime Minister of the day is to be the head. I venture to think that is a great mistake; but I do not wish to discuss it now. I think the Prime Minister ought to be out of all that, leaving the Cabinet to say whether what is proposed by the Defence Committee is right or wrong. Speaking at the South African dinner, at which the Duke of Marlborough presided, Sir Neville Lyttelton said—

> "The British Army was in the smelting-pot again; it had been there very often. He hoped that the scheme to be promulgated next week would please the public. Sometimes he had some misgivings, and doubts arose in his mind. They did their best, but it was making bricks without straw."

I leave the House to say what that want of straw is. Sir Neville Lyttelton continued—

> "This year money was short and men were short both in numbers and stature. They had done their best with regard to the scheme, but he was not happy—far from it."

My Lords, I cannot do better, I think, than close my remarks with these words, these very comforting words, from the officer who, above all others, has been chosen to represent the Army on the Defence Committee. I hope they will give comfort to your Lordships. I have no doubt they do to those who sit on the Government Bench. I also hope they will induce your Lordships, as they ought to do, to support the Motion that I now humbly move.

Moved to resolve: "That this House, while reaffirming the Resolution passed by the Lords in 1883, 'That having regard to the present defective military organisation, and to the great importance of the Militia Force, it is essential that the Militia should be forthwith recruited up to its established strength,' is further of opinion that so long as the Militia continues to be, as it now is, the constitutional basis of our existing military system it should be so raised as not to compete for voluntary recruits, as it now does, with the Regular Army to the great detriment of the military forces of the Crown."—(*The Earl of Wemyss.*)

LORD NEWTON: My Lords, lest there should be any doubt as to whether the noble Earl will receive any support, I rise at once to assure him that I, at all events, will go into the lobby in support of his Motion. Neither do I see any reason why the Motion should not be supported by the votes of every Member present who is in favour of maintaining the Militia. The Motion does not commit anyone to the particular nostrum favoured by the noble Earl, and those persons who are in favour of the continuance of the Militia can vote for the Motion with a clear conscience. The other day my noble friend the Under-Secretary of State for War, expatiated with, I thought, some envy on the peculiarly favourable position which is occupied by my noble friend Lord Wemyss. It appears to me that on this particular occasion he enjoys a more favourable position than ever, because he has every right to count upon the support of the Government.

I do not think that sufficient recognition has ever been paid to the dealings of this Government and of the last Government with regard to the Militia, and I think it just as well to refresh the memory of the House upon this subject. In 1899 the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs introduced a Militia Ballot Bill. The next year the noble Earl opposite, Lord Wemyss, brought in the same Bill and was opposed not only by the Government but by the Front Opposition Bench. As a rule, I believe the theory of legislation is that when a Government Bill is introduced it represents the settled convictions of Ministers and the collective policy of the Government; but in this particular case we must adopt a totally different theory. The theory I have in my mind with regard to this particular Bill is that it was introduced much on the same principle as that on which the drunken helot used to be introduced at Spartan feasts—as an object to be avoided. This is a species of legislation which might be defined as legislation by scarecrow.

I confess that anything which is brought forward by my noble friend stands a very poor chance of acceptance in this House. The two Front Benches invariably combine against him, and I have before expressed the opinion that if the noble Earl brought forward a Motion that two and two made four, or that the earth was round, the two Front Benches would unite and say they made something totally different, or that the earth was flat Therefore, any Motion proposed by the noble Earl is foredoomed to failure. He is looked upon, in fact, by both Front Benches as a sort of *hostis humani generis*. For my part, though I may be singular in my views, I maintain that the proposals brought forward by the noble Earl are infinitely more practicable and more definite than all the recommendations of your Hartington Commission, your Dawkins Commission, your Esher Committee, and your Elgin Commission. With the one exception of the Commission presided over by the Duke of Norfolk, the recommendations brought forward have been recommendations for the improvement, reorganisation, and what they call the "co-ordination" of our military system. Practically they deal with nothing but War Office reorganisation.

My noble friend, whether you agree with him or not, goes to the root of the matter, and proposes a definite solution, inasmuch as he puts forward a really solid basis upon which the military edifice may be constructed. I do not propose on this occasion to repeat the arguments which have already been used in this House by myself and others on the subject of compulsion. I have no doubt we shall have many future opportunities of returning to this subject, but I do not think anybody present can be in any sort of doubt as to the actual value of the Militia and as to the inestimable value which it has been to us in the past. If you only take the late war as an instance, I think any impartial person would be bound to admit that the services of the other two branches of the Auxiliary Forces, that is to say, the Volunteers and the Yeomanry, cannot be compared for one moment with the services rendered by the Militia. The Militia sent something like 100,000 men to the war, and I will go so far as to say this, that if it had not been for the existence of the Militia, I do not believe it would have been possible for us to have carried on that war at all, because, as everybody knows, they took the place of the Regular Army when we had sent every available man to South Africa.

But if anybody feels any doubt as to the relative value of the various portions of the Auxiliary Forces, it can very soon be demonstrated if you take, for instance, the test of embodiment. You would then realise the infinite superiority of the Militia over the other two branches. We know, not only from speeches which have been delivered in this House, but also in consequence of the Report of the Duke of Norfolk's Commission, that in the opinion of those who have had the best opportunities of studying this question, the Militia can only be kept up by resorting in some form or other to compulsion. My noble friend the Under-Secretary of State for War, speaking the other day in your Lordships' House, strongly repudiated the idea of compulsion, and, with an ingenuity which really would have done credit to the oldest Parliamentary hand, he actually established a difference, a most important difference, between the principle of the Militia ballot and the principle of universal service. I admit at once that my intelligence is not sufficiently nimble to follow my noble friend through these distinctions. Personally, I see very little difference between the two things, but I do not despair of my noble friend. When the day arrives, some years, or possibly, some months hence, when we migrate to the other side, I entertain a faint hope that I shall hear my noble friend pointing out to his successor on this Bench that the one absolutely necessary thing in order to put our military affairs in order is to resort to the principle of compulsion. [The Earl of DONOUGHMORE dissented.] The fact is, the principle of compulsion is receiving allies from the most unexpected quarters.

The noble Earl who moved the Motion now before your Lordships has drawn attention to a most important speech which was delivered last week by General Sir Neville Lyttelton. I was prepared to read a number of extracts from this speech, but, as Lord Wemyss has done so, I will not trouble the House with them. I must, however, draw attention to one particular phrase. General Lyttelton, after stating that he felt no confidence whatever in the coming scheme, stated that he did not like the French word "conscription," and preferred to use the English words, "compulsory service"; and, referring to compulsory service, he said he disagreed with the Norfolk Commission, who wanted compulsory service for home defence. The only explanation you can put upon this is that Sir Neville Lyttelton wants it for foreign service. I believe he has already withdrawn some of his expressions, but the most important part of his speech was the sentence with which he concluded—

> "When I speak of even a modified form of compulsory service I am not speaking as an official, but it will come one of these days."

That is what we have to bear in mind. Whether he approves of it or not we know what he anticipates. General Lyttelton is not only a very highly distinguished soldier; he is the first military member of the Army Council, and he is practically our English Chief of the Staff. He announced that he was only speaking for himself. I contend that a man in his position is quite unable to speak for himself in his private capacity. This is not an utterance of an irresponsible person.

General Lyttelton is not a man who can be described as rash or indiscreet. His words must inevitably carry great weight, not only in Parliament, but throughout the country; and what do they mean? Well, they mean this, either that he despairs of solving the military problem, or that he thinks the coming scheme is based upon the probability of its popularity in the country rather than upon securing the national safety. In any case, I am sorry to say that this speech suggests that as much indecision, if not chaos, prevails under the present conditions at the War Office as in former days; and with regard to what is now taking place at the War Office, I cannot help being reminded of that phrase which I have often heard applied to continually changing French Governments, "*plus cela change plus c'est la même chose.*"

I am not one of those persons who have habitually abused the War Office. I have never indulged in what I have always thought has been senseless abuse of the War Office, because I think it absurd to charge the War Office with the shortcomings of our military administration; but I do not think anyone, however ignorant, can fail to recognise the want of purpose, the want of decision, and the want of a definite policy which characterise the management of our military affairs. We have within a very recent period witnessed the introduction and the abandonment of a most ambitious and far-reaching scheme. We learn from the Duke of Norfolk's Commission that not so long ago the Defence Committee had no clear idea of the purpose for which the Militia and Volunteers existed. We witnessed quite recently the Prime Minister appointing a Commission to deal with this most important question, and then airily, and probably without having read the evidence, saying he would not have anything to do with their recommendations. And now, to crown it all, we have the First Military Lord practically throwing over the Secretary of State for War.

VISCOUNT HARDINGE: My Lords, we are indebted to the noble Earl for bringing this question to the notice of your Lordships' House. Speaking as a Militia officer, I can say that all the members of the force, officers, non-commissioned officers, and men, will be glad to think they have the noble Earl as the champion of their cause. We have in this House several noble Lords who are commanding officers of Militia, including two members of His Majesty's Government, and for that reason the Militia had every hope that their interests and welfare would be in good hands; but if rumour is true, that is not the case. We are told that the Secretary of State for War, with the sanction of His Majesty's Government, proposes to abolish the Militia altogether. If such is the case, I feel sure that most of your Lordships will agree with the statement which appeared in the *Standard* last week, to the effect that the idea of destroying the Militia will be received not so much with indignation as with astonishment that such a proposal could ever be seriously put forward by a responsible Government. I think I am perfectly justified in asking the noble Earl the Under-Secretary of State for War whether that rumour is true or not, and, if it is true, how it appeared in the newspapers—in the *Standard* and the *Daily Express*—before it was proclaimed to the world by the Secretary of State for War. No wonder the senior Military Lord on the War Office Council, when making a speech the other evening, said that his mind was uneasy. It is perfectly true, as he stated, that the Army at the present moment is not only short of men, but that the men are short in stature. If the Secretary of State for War thinks that that is going to be rectified by the abolition of the Militia, I think it will be some time before the mind of the gallant officer to whom I have referred is made any easier. Until I hear it officially announced I shall refuse to believe the astounding rumour that the Militia is to be abolished.

Personally, I am in favour of compulsory service. I am not, however, a supporter of the ballot; and I would remind the House that the Duke of Norfolk's Commission declared that compulsory service for home defence is preferable to the ballot. I concur with the noble Earl in his tribute to the members of this Commission. I think they deserve the gratitude of the nation for speaking the plain truth, and telling the people that the country is, so far as its defence is concerned, living in a fool's paradise. The noble Duke told us the other day that that was the reason why all the members of his Commission were unanimous in saying there must be compulsory service of some kind.

When a fortnight ago my noble friend Lord Newton called attention to the Report of the Esher Committee, the only noble Lord, other than the two members of the Government, who spoke against compulsory service was the noble and gallant Lord who commands the Gloucestershire Militia. The noble and gallant Lord said he did not think the country was ripe for such a system. I believe that if the change is not necessary now, it never will be. The opinion of Lord Bathurst is not the opinion of most commanding officers of Militia. He will find that most of them agree with the Duke of Richmond, who commands a Militia regiment and was one of those who signed the Report of the Norfolk Commission favouring compulsory service. I think Militia officers would rather take the opinion of the noble Duke, who has had longer experience in the Militia, than that of the noble Lord. On the other hand, however, the noble Lord (Earl Bathurst) has on his side the Under-Secretary of State for War. The Under-Secretary stated the other day that his reason for opposing compulsory service was that it would involve considerable expenditure, but that does not agree with the Report of the Duke of Norfolk's Commission, for they stated that, after having gone thoroughly into the subject, they considered that under compulsory service the expenditure would be a great deal less than at present.

Another reason given by the Under-Secretary for opposing compulsory service was the difficulty of getting skilled instructors. Surely that is a matter for legislation. If other countries who go in for compulsory service are able to find instructors, surely they could be found in this country. In the same speech the noble Earl the Under-Secretary said that if we were to lose command of the sea, we would be well advised to lay down our arms and sue for peace with the enemy—a proposal which, if I may say so without offence to the noble Earl, would be scorned and repudiated by every man calling himself an Englishman. I would prefer to rely upon the noble and patriotic instincts of the people, well drawn out in the cartoon in *Punch* last week, where we find a humourist not afraid to put the truth, which is that an island Power should organise its forces on the basis of national duty. This is an example which we have received from our ally Japan. The lesson that is taught us surely gives ample food for reflection, especially when we think that in this vast population of ours only one man out of every ten does any actual service for his country.

We have learned in South Africa that modern war is a scientific matter. We therefore do not want men who, when emergency arises, rush to arms and become food for powder. The day of putting a pike in a man's hand at the last moment has long since gone by. For this reason we require the best of the manhood of the nation, not the men we have been getting of late, and they can only be obtained, in my opinion, by some form of compulsory service. I know one of the great arguments against compulsory service is that if we had such service for home defence, we would not get the men for our volunteer Army to serve abroad and in India. In my opinion we would get men to join the Army then who had never thought of joining it before, in the same way as many men who are in the Army now have gone in through the Militia and would never have gone into the Army if there had not been a Militia Force. This is only the second time that I have had the honour of addressing your Lordships' House, and I thank you for the indulgence you have granted to me. I felt that in the circumstances it was my duty, as an officer commanding a Militia battalion, to raise my voice in support of the noble Lord's Motion.

EARL BATHURST: My Lords, I had not intended to address your Lordships to-night, and I only rise to say two or three words in answer to the remarks of my noble friend who has just sat down. He referred to a speech I made some ten days ago, and I am afraid he drew a wrong impression from it. I did not say that I was not in favour of compulsion. I said that I thought the country was not ready and was not prepared to vote for compulsion. I am, on the whole, in favour of compulsion and still more in favour of the Militia ballot, and I shall have very great pleasure in supporting the Motion now before your Lordships' House.

LORD ROSMEAD: My Lords, the time has now arrived when something will have to be done as regards the old constitutional force. I thoroughly agree with every word that has been said by the noble Earl who so eloquently brought forward this Motion. It will be impossibe for the Militia to continue as it is now. As your Lordships are aware, it becomes weaker and weaker every year, and if the decrease continues it will in time cease to exist. I am sure your Lordships will agree with me when I say that it would be a serious loss to the nation if a force like the Militia, which has rendered such excellent service in the past, should cease to exist, and therefore I consider it essential that some drastic steps should be taken to ensnre its remaining a part of His Majesty's forces. The noble Earl, as I understand, is in favour of the ballot being amended and brought up to date so that it could be enforced. With that I entirely agree. I am not speaking without some experience of the Militia before going into the Regular Army, and I have had experience of it since. For at present I have the honour of holding a commission in that force.

The ballot is either a good or a bad substitute. If it is a bad one it should be repealed; if is a good one it should be applied; but as it is at present it is worse than useless. The ballot looks like the beginning of conscription or compulsory service, and, ugly as it may sound to a nation which has always prided itself on maintaining a voluntary Army, I venture to think the time is not far off when some form of modified compulsory service will have to be adopted if we are going to maintain such a strong and effective Army as is necessary. The time now appears to be ripe when a commencement should be made in that direction by enforcing ballot for the Militia, and I therefore trust your Lordships will support the Motion moved by the noble Earl.

***THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE**: My Lords, I should, of course, be the very last to question the right of any Member of your Lordships' House to initiate a discussion upon any subject at any time; but still I cannot help thinking that my position is rather a difficult one this afternoon, and at the same time it is, certainly to myself, and possibly to noble Lords, rather an unsatisfactory one. Your Lordships are aware that the Prime Minister has made a statement this afternoon to the effect that the Secretary of State for War will make his statement upon a scheme of Army reform on Thursday next. Naturally I have no intention of saying anything this evening which would in any way foreshadow that statement, and I am sure that in saying that your Lordships will acquit me of any want of respect to the House. But when a big scheme of Army or any other reform is to be introduced it is only right that the principal Minister concerned should make his statement himself and should make it as a concrete whole. For this reason I would ask the noble Viscount behind me, Lord Hardinge, to be a little patient. He has accepted certain rumours that have been about during the last few days as gospel truth and has asked me for a categorical affirmation or denial. I would ask the noble Viscount, and I am sure he will meet me so far, to be patient until Thursday next, when he can hear the scheme of my right hon. friend in its completeness, and I am sure your Lordships will then be very glad to listen to any criticisms or remarks that he may have to make upon it.

As regards the Motion which is before us my noble friend Lord Newton said that anybody could vote for it, suggesting presumably that it really does not commit anybody to anything in particular, that it does not commit noble Lords who support it to compulsory service, to the ballot, or to anything else. It is perfectly true that the words of the Motion do not contain either the words compulsory service or the ballot, but still I think any noble Lord who is acquainted with the noble Earl, Lord Wemyss, knows perfectly well what was in his mind when he put this Motion down, and knows perfectly well, if he has read the report of the debate in 1883 which is referred to in the Motion, that after all it is to the principle of the ballot that the noble Earl wishes to commit the House; and noble Lords who go into the lobby with the noble Earl must do so with the full consciousness that they are pledging themselves to the ballot, and to the ballot definitely. Before passing on to the more general question I would ask to be allowed to say a word upon a speech that has been very much quoted—I refer to the speech made last week by my friend Sir Neville Lyttelton. The noble Lord behind me, Lord Newton, said that Sir Neville Lyttelton had already withdrawn part of that speech.

LORD NEWTON: He did so in a letter to the *Westminster Gazette* of Saturday.

*THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: I do not know anything about a letter in the *Westminster Gazette*, but I have here a copy of a letter published in the *Standard*, in which Sir Neville Lyttelton did not withdraw anything that he said, but repudiated the interpretation that had been put upon the speech in certain quarters, which is a very different story. Sir Neville Lyttelton has been quoted in your Lordships' House to-day and elsewhere as being in favour of compulsory service. The noble Earl, Lord Wemyss, quoted part of Sir Neville Lyttelton's speech, but did not quote one sentence, which, I think, is very germane to this discussion. It is a sentence towards the end of the speech. Sir Neville had already said that he preferred the words "compulsory service," to conscription, and he proceeded—

> "He did not now put it forward."

When Sir Neville Lyttelton says definitely that he does not now put the policy of compulsory service forward, it is not quite fair to claim him as being in the same camp as those who have been advocating compulsory service in your Lordships' House this evening. But I have gone further. I have seen Sir Neville Lyttelton twice upon this point and have ascertained his views a little more definitely than they are shown in the very different reports that there are of his speech as made the other night. I do not like quoting the opinion of any individual member of the Army Council, but I think your Lordships will realise that this is an exceptional occasion. Sir Neville Lyttelton authorises me to say that he recognises at once that public opinion is not in favour of any form of compulsory service.

*THE EARL OF WEMYSS: Why?

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: I will prove that to the noble Earl before sitting down. Sir Neville Lyttelton recognises that public opinion is not in favour of any form of compulsory service, and, as he said in his speech, he has no desire to introduce it now. He does not like compulsion for its own sake, but he cannot keep out of his mind the possibility of some day being forced to adopt it. He is in favour of doing everything he can to avoid it.

*THE EARL OF WEMYSS: They have been doing that for forty years.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: And I hope they will continue doing it for another forty years. As I have said, Sir Neville Lyttelton is in favour of trying everything to avoid adopting it, and for that reason he entirely supports the scheme which will be put forward by my right hon. friend the Secretary of of State for War on Thursday next. That is what I am authorised by Sir Neville Lyttelton to say, and I think that statement will, perhaps, make matters clearer than they have been on this subject. To return to the question of compulsory service. My noble friend Lord Newton mentioned that I endeavoured the other day to prove to your Lordships that there was a great difference between compulsory service, as advocated by him and by the Norfolk Commission, and the ballot, and he said he was unable to follow my string of reasoning. If I remember rightly, I do not think I produced any string of reasoning. I produced a quotation from the evidence given before the Commission by the noble Earl Lord Wemyss, whom I recognised as the greatest living authority on the subject of the ballot.

LORD NEWTON: What the noble Earl argued was that Lord Methuen, who gave evidence in favour of the Militia ballot, was, in consequence of that, opposed to personal universal service.

***THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE**: That was in another part of my speech. The noble Earl, Lord Wemyss, said most distinctly in his evidence:—

> "Universal obligation is alleviated by the chance selection of a few. Thus, the ballot is quite distinct from Continental universal conscription."

It was on that that I relied in claiming that there was an absolute difference between enforcing everybody to serve and the ballot. Viscount Hardinge and my noble friend Lord Newton said a great deal this afternoon upon the subject of compulsory service, but I claim that that has nothing whatever to do with what is advocated by the noble Earl in this Motion. We have already had a debate upon the subject of universal compulsory service as advocated by the Royal Commission, and if your Lordships choose to have another one I shall, of course, attempt to take my part in it; but I do not think it is necessary for me to go in any detail into the various arguments that have been brought forward on the subject this evening.

I will confine my attention more particularly to the ballot, which is advocated by Lord Wemyss. The noble Earl quoted a number of authorities as being in favour of the ballot. He read out as distinguished a list of names as could be found in English history. I should have thought, as regards some of the earlier names, that we might have claimed that conditions had changed a little. Mr. Pitt, after all, did not know what a battleship was that was driven by steam. But I do wish to draw your Lordships' attention to the last name quoted by the noble Lord, namely, that of my noble friend the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. The noble Marquess's opinions are well known in your Lordships' House. I presume the noble Earl based his inclusion of the noble Marquess upon the fact that my noble friend introduced a Militia Ballot Bill two years ago, but, if I remember rightly, it was made perfectly clear on that occasion, and I think Lord Newton recognises that fact, that the Bill was simply brought in, if I may use a phrase I have heard used with considerable effect by Lord Ribblesdale, as a sort of pilot balloon. It was brought in as illustrating the form such a Bill should take if carried through Parliament. It was made quite clear that it was not the intention of the Government to pass it, and that the Government had no intention of adopting the ballot as a definite policy.

After all, what are our objections to the ballot? Firstly, there is the fact—and this has not been recognised by noble Lords this afternoon who have been quoting the Duke of Norfolk's Commission—that that Commission rejected the ballot in no equivocal terms. They rejected it because they said it was unsuited to the conditions of this country; they rejected it because it would press unfairly upon the poorer classes; they rejected it owing to its general unfairness and general unsuitability. We entirely accept and agree with all those contentions. I would add that we do consider that the use of the ballot for the Militia would considerably increase our difficulties in getting voluntary recruits for our Regular Army—difficulties which are quite great enough at the present moment. As the noble Earl, Lord Wemyss, has alluded in his Motion to the debate which took place in 1883, perhaps I may be allowed to read a few lines from the speech delivered on that occasion by the noble Duke the late Duke of Cambridge, who was then Commander-in-Chief. The noble Duke said—

> "The noble Marquess at the head of the War Office and the noble Earl the Under-Secretary of State for War were endeavouring to find the best means of bringing the Line up to its full strength. Until that had been done they could not force recruiting for the Militia, because by so doing they would injure recruiting for the Line."

I venture to think those words from His late Royal Highness will find general agreement in your Lordships' House this evening.

I now come to the last argument which I would bring to your Lordships' notice as to our objection to the ballot. It has been characterised by the noble Earl as fear of the voter. We object to the noble Lord's proposal because we have the strongest evidence—it is stronger now than ever before—that the ballot would be very unpopular in the country. We have the evidence that was given before the Duke of Norfolk's Commission. The question was asked of eighteen witnesses whether they thought that the ballot would be popularly or unpopularly received in this country. Four of the witnesses answered that they thought it would be popular, and fourteen in the negative, and I would remind your Lordships who those witnesses were. First there was the noble Earl himself, who told the Commission about his 400 circulars. I do not think, my Lords, that the 400 individuals the noble Earl wrote to can possibly be fairly claimed as representing the whole of the nation. But still the noble Earl said, and his experience is greater than anybody else's, that wherever he had spoken in favour of the Militia ballot he had heard no word of hostility. I presume he excepted your Lordships' House, because I believed the noble Earl has asked your Lordships on several occasions, without success, to affirm the principle of the ballot. The second witness who said he thought the ballot would not be unpopular was Sir William Nicholson, a great authority, of course, who opined that the trades unions would like it as a help towards the solution of the question of the unemployed. The third witness was Lord Methuen, who said he had not noticed a feeling against the ballot for the Militia; and, lastly there was Colonel Howarth, of Lancashire, who said he thought Lancashire would dislike it at first, but would get to like it in the end. Not very strong testimony perhaps, my Lords, in favour of the popularity of the ballot! The fourteen witnesses who said that they thought the ballot would be very unpopular in the country included Sir Evelyn Wood, Sir W. F. Butler, Sir Henry Hildyard, Mr. R. W. Burbridge (General Manager of Harrod's Stores, Ltd.), Mr. George F. Shee (Secretary of the National Service League), and Colonels of regiments from Inverness, Glasgow, Lancashire, Bedfordshire, Buckinghamshire, and Surrey, two from South Wales, and one from Ireland. That is testimony from all parts of the country, and testimony which, I think, your Lordships will admit is very valuable in this particular. It is because, in addition to the reasons I have given, that I think the Militia ballot would be unpopular in the country, and rightly unpopular because unjust, that I ask your Lordships to vote against the noble Earl's Motion.

*EARL SPENCER: My Lords, I am sure that no one in this House will resent the Motion of my noble friend. We all in this House admire the man who has strong convictions, and who, notwithstanding opposition and defeat, still holds to those convictions and brings them forward as opportunity offers. We admire, I need not say, the vigour and the energy and the eloquence he displays, qualities which in a young man we might be proud of, but which when coming from him we admire all the more. The noble Viscount referred to rumours that were current with regard to what His Majesty's Government intended to do with regard to the Militia. I deprecate altogether fastening any argument on rumours. I do not intend to do so. I feel that this is a matter so grave and so important that a statement must come from the Government itself before we attach any importance to the rumour set about in regard to this matter. I do not blame my noble friend for having referred to it, but I think it right to state what view I hold on such a matter.

The noble Earl who spoke so admirably for the War Office dealt with this question, and I heard from him for the first time that in another place the Prime Minister had announced that the Secretary for War would declare the policy of the Government on this subject next Thursday. I think it right, as here representing the Opposition, to claim for this House the privilege and right and opportunity of expressing also their opinion and of having a statement made to them on this subject. On a matter of finance we know our position. We know we are not able to criticise in detail or to throw out in detail any measure of finance. But this is not a question of finance. No doubt eventually it will effect finance, but it is a principle of great national importance. It covers a great deal of ground. It will lay—I was going to say the foundations, but there have been so many foundations laid and ruthlessly torn up by the Government who have laid them—it will lay down a great policy again; and it is only due to your Lordships' House that you should have an opportunity of hearing from the responsible representative of the Government what the scheme is, and that your Lordships should have an opportunity of expressing an opinion. Therefore, I ask the noble Marquess, the Leader of the House, to respond to this appeal which I make, and to say that he will give this early opportunity.

I now come to a matter exceedingly painful to me, because it concerns a near and dear friend of mine, who has lately achieved a high position at the War Office on the Military Council and who has within the last few days made a speech. I have the highest regard and affection for Sir Neville Lyttelton, and it is painful to me to refer in what must be, I am afraid, a somewhat critical mood to what he has stated. I hope that, if he has made what I fear may be a mistake in dealing with matters as he has done, it is from the novelty of the position he holds and to his not, perhaps, being aware what, as I at least think—and I do not know that the Government will differ from me—is the constitutional position in which he stands as a member of the Army Council. As the leading Military Adviser of the Secretary of State for War, he made a very important speech on this question last Thursday. The noble Earl has referred to it, and he has also referred to certain explanations that have been given. But what do they amount to? The explanations certainly amount to this—that, though the question may not be imminent, the Chief Military Adviser of the Secretary of State has declared opinions which certainly, so far as I know, do not agree with those of His Majesty's Government. No doubt there have been two letters written by him explaining his speech; but I confess I do not think myself that these letters materially alter the situation. He alludes in the first instance to the scheme which His Majesty's Government were about to announce, and, as an old soldier, he says that he looks with doubt upon it and has considerable fear of what may be the result.

I venture to think that this brings before us in a very marked—in a very serious—way the position of the Army Council. I do not know exactly whether the Army Council is based on the model of the Board of Admiralty. In my opinion, every member of the Board of Admiralty, as a member of the Government, is not entitled to make, and does wrong in making, a statement on a question on which he differs from the Government. I am afraid very much that Sir Neville Lyttelton may have exceeded the proper limits by stating that his views differed from those of His Majesty's Government. I have made these remarks with the greatest possible pain, but I hope that Sir Neville Lyttelton's action has arisen from a misconception on his part of his position. I hope we may have some full explanation of Sir Neville Lyttelton's views. I am sure that he is a man of such honour and good sense that he will be ready to understand his position; for I feel it is of the greatest importance with regard to this new branch of administration at the War Office that they and the public should understand exactly how they stand in regard to making independent speeches on such important subjects, and that a member of the Military Council cannot speak, while holding that office, as a private individual. I have made these remarks with every wish to be perfectly fair to my friend and relative, and I feel quite sure that his action arose from the novelty of his position. As I hope we are to have an important debate on the subject of the Army, I shall reserve my opinion on a great many questions which belong to that subject. I hope my noble friend will not divide the House.

*THE EARL OF WEMYSS: Certainly I shall.

EARL SPENCER: Well, if he does it will be my personal duty to vote against him, because I do not think it would be possible for anyone reading the division list not to infer that those who voted with my noble friend were in favour of the ballot or in favour of conscription.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of LANSDOWNE): My Lords, I have heard with great relief the announcement of the noble Earl opposite that he had no intention of pressing us for a premature statement on the Government Army scheme. It would obviously be unfair, both to the authors of the scheme and to your Lordships' House, that it should be disclosed by fragments in the course of a debate like this. But we admit the reasonableness of the noble Earl's demand that your Lordships should be given a full opportunity of considering and discussing the Government scheme, although I do not think I can specify at this moment the precise form in which the opportunity may be given or the particular date at which it may be afforded to the House. I regret that we should have been obliged to postpone to a comparatively late period of the session the disclosure of our views on this important subject; but I do appeal with some confidence to the indulgence of your Lordships, because I think it can scarcely be denied that the task on which the War Office has been engaged is one of the most difficult tasks which has ever fallen to the lot of a public Department.

We are endeavouring to reconstitute one of the most complicated Army systems known to any country. We are endeavouring to do so by the light of recently acquired experience and in view of new principles which have not been sufficiently recognised until very recently. The difficulty is increased by the all-pervading question of expense, which has to be taken into account when we consider the rapid growth of the Army and Navy Estimates during the last few years; and last, but not least, we have endeavoured to do these things amidst the pressure and turmoil of a busy session of Parliament. I hope your Lordships will not think that we have been playing with this subject or trifling with the House because we have not been able to come before you with our proposals at an earlier moment.

The noble Earl devoted a considerable portion of his remarks to a speech delivered by Sir Neville Lyttelton. Let me say at once that, as a question of general principle, I agree with the noble Earl opposite in thinking that speeches on these subjects by military officials, holding high positions, are not desirable, and are, as far as possible, to be avoided; but in this case Sir Neville Lyttelton was placed in a somewhat embarrassing position. He was taking part in one of those festivities in which we all have to take part from time to time. He was called upon unexpectedly to make a speech, and he spoke, I am sure, with the utmost frankness, straight from his heart. But did he really do anything that amounted to or could be represented as throwing over his official chief? He admitted he had misgivings as to the Government scheme; but if you can show me anyone who will put forward a scheme of Army reorganisation and will say that he does so without misgivings, I shall wonder at, but I shall not admire, the confidence of that individual.

*EARL SPENCER: He would not say it.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: If, in those circumstances, Sir Neville Lyttelton's faith in the War Office scheme was the kind of faith which is sometimes represented as connected with honest doubt, I do not think we can greatly blame him. But Sir Neville Lyttelton, so far from saying or suggesting anything to give the idea that he was not at one with the Secretary of State's scheme, has most distinctly intimated that he approves of it, and thinks it the best scheme which can be devised in the circumstances. It is true that he made the reservation that in his opinion a really satisfactory scheme such as, I presume, a soldier and non-politician would approve could not be arrived at without some form of compulsion; but he expressly intimated that he regarded compulsion as being for the time out of the question, and he avoided putting any such proposal forward. I, therefore, do not think that Sir Neville Lyttelton's observations were of a kind that merits animadversion on the part of your Lordships.

There is one other matter as to which I should like to say a word. The noble Earl at the Table and Lord Newton both quoted me as an authority in support of the Militia ballot, and they cited the fact that I had introduced into your Lordships' House a Militia Ballot Bill as conclusive evidence on that point. I feel bound to refresh the otherwise excellent memories of the noble Lords as to the circumstances in which that Bill was laid on the Table of the House. We had had many discussions on the ballot, and I had been constrained by the eloquent arguments of the noble Earl to admit that the machinery of the ballot was in an obsolete and unsatisfactory condition. The ballot, as the noble Earl knew, was, and is, the law of the land, although it is suspended from year to year by special legislation; and I was bound to admit that, so long as the ballot was the law of the land, it was reasonable to ask that the machinery for enforcing it should be in such a condition as to render it reasonably possible that, if we had ever to resort to the ballot, that machinery could be made to work.

I took the advice of my legal advisers on the subject and I introduced the Bill, expressly guarding myself against the suggestion that I was in favour of the ballot; and I think I am right in saying that the noble Earl twitted me not a little on my want of courage in taking that course. I do not think the omens are at this moment propitious for proposals for introducing the ballot. It has received a rude shaking from the Report of the Duke of Norfolk's Commission. At any rate it is out of the question that we should at a moment like this take up a proposal to introduce the ballot. I will not again travel over the ground which the noble Earl who represents the War Office has so fully occupied. I have listened, as we all have, with admiration to the speech of the noble Earl, and I think the debates which he elicits on occasions like this serve a good purpose, for they enable us to consider these matters and to hear the views of noble Lords who are connected with the Militia and take an interest in its affairs. But I am afraid that for all practical purposes the Motion which he has put on the Paper, and which, if it means anything, is a suggestion in favour of the ballot is one which we cannot possibly accept, and if it is pressed to a division we shall have to vote against it.

*THE EARL OF WEMYSS: I merely quoted Sir Neville Lyttelton as showing that he was not happy about the new Government scheme of Army reform. As to the etiquette of his making such a speech, in view of his position on the Defence Committee, I know nothing. But at any rate we know this, that whatever the measure of the Government may be which is to be produced on Thursday next, it does not make the first military authority on the Defence Committee very happy. We have heard from the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs that the War Office have got a most difficult and complicated task in reconstituting the Army. I have always held that it is the simplest thing in the world if the Government would only do their duty. We are the only nation in the world, civilised or uncivilised, which has a military system which is not enforced by those who are responsible for the safety of the nation. As to the supposed need of producing a measure which would not be unpopular, I have never known the public and the nation refuse that which the responsible officers of the Crown, answerable for the safety of the nation, told them was necessary, no matter whether it was disagreeable to them or not; and on that position I stand. I thank the noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition for the kind way in which he spoke about myself.

As to my noble friend Lord Lansdowne being quoted by me as in favour of the ballot, I would explain that it arose from my noble friend having said in this House three years ago that the power of the ballot in a case of emergency was a power with which he would not readily dispense. I then urged that it would not do to wait till an emergency did arise before beginning to deal with an Act which my noble friend had admitted was obsolete. I then pressed him to bring forward a Bill which, as long as the ballot remained the law of the land, would enable it to be put in force, and the result was that my noble friend brought in a Bill, but he put it down, not as a measure to make an obsolete Act operative, but as showing the sort of Bill that the Government would bring in to make the ballot effective when emergency arose. You have not the courage to repeal an Act which you say you cannot enforce because it is unpopular, but you do not make it so that you can enforce it in case of emergency. The position taken up by the Government is an absolutely untenable one. The noble Earl the Under-Secretary quoted Mr. Shee. I have had a correspondence with that gentleman, who wrote to me, objecting to the Militia ballot on the ground that it was invidious. I am still waiting for an answer to my last letter to Mr. Shee, in which I in substance said—

> "You call the ballot a hardship, while I should call it a hardship if, needlessly, the whole country had to go like foreigners into compulsory Militia service, of which the ballot, like decimation, is an alleviation."

I feel so strongly upon this that I shall divide the House as an expression of my own opinion that the Militia ought to be kept up to its full strength and should be so raised that it does not compete with the Regular Army for voluntary recruits. Your Lordships' House is, as regards this Motion, in exactly the same position as it was twenty years ago. Then, as I said in my opening remarks, a Motion was brought forward in the same spirit as the one I have moved to-night. On that occasion both Front Benches were in combination against it. They are also combined against it to-night; but, notwithstanding that, I will still hope there is independence and public spirit enough in your Lordships' House to secure for the Motion substantial support.

On Question, their Lordships divided:—Contents, 21; Not-contents, 59.

CONTENTS.

Norfolk, D. (*E. Marshall.*)
Argyll, D.
Richmond, D.

Abercorn, M. (*D. Abercorn.*)

Abingdon, E.
Bathurst, E.
Carlisle, E.
Dartrey, E.
Egerton, E.

Hardinge, V.

Chelmsford, L.
Monck, L. (*V. Monck.*)
Muncaster, L.
Muskerry, L.
Newtown, L. [*Teller.*]
Oranmore and Browne, L.
Playfair, L.
Rosmead, L.
Sherborne, L.
Stanmore, L.
Wemyss, L. (*E. Wemyss*) [*Teller.*]

NOT-CONTENTS.

Halsbury, E. (*L. Chancellor.*)
Vane, E. (*M. Londonderry.*) (*L. President.*)
Salisbury, M. (*L. Privy Seal.*)

Devonshire, D.
Grafton, D.
Marlborough, D.
Portland, D.
Ailesbury, M.
Bath, M.
Camden, M.
Lansdowne, M.

Pembroke and Montgomery, E. (*L. Steward.*)
Clarendon, E. (*L. Chamberlain.*)
Carrington, E.
Craven, E.
Crewe, E.
Dartmouth, E.
Hardwicke, E.
Lauderdale, E.
Mayo, E.
Romney, E.
Selborne, E.
Spencer, E.
Waldegrave, E. [*Teller.*]
Westmeath, E.
Yarborough, E.

Churchill, V. [*Teller.*]
Cross, V.
Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore.*)
Sidmouth, V.

Amherst of Hackney, L.
Barrymore, L.
Belper, L.
Brassey, L.
Braye, L.
Calthorpe, L.
Cottesloe, L.
Ellenborough, L.
Glanusk, L.
Hawkesbury, L.
Heneage, L.
James, L.
Kenyon, L.
Killanin, L.
Kilmarnock, L. (*E. Erroll.*)
Lawrence, L.
Leigh, L.
Lovat, L.
Lyveden, L.
Monkswell, L.
Ravensworth, L.
Ribblesdale, L.
Sandhurst, L.
Shuttleworth, L.
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Tweedmouth, L.
Willoughby de Broke, L.
Windsor, L.
Wolverton, L.

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Seven o'clock till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 11*th July*, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—Buxton Urban District Council Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.:—Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 3) Bill [Lords]; Scotch Education Department Provisional Order Confirmation (Edinburgh) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time To-morrow.

Barrow-in-Furness Corporation Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Liverpool and Wigan Churches Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

Llanelly Harbour Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; a clause added; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

Loch Leven Water Power Bill. As amended, considered. Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Tynemouth Corporation Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Bridlington Corporation Bill [Lords]; Bristol Tramways (Extensions) Bill [Lords]; Lord Tredegar's Supplemental Estate Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed.

Manchester Corporation (General Powers) Bill [Lords]; Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [Lords]; Scarisbrick Estate (Amendment) Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed.

Arbroath Corporation Water Order Confirmation Bill; Dunfermline District Water Order Confirmation Bill; Glasgow Corporation (Police) Order Confirmation Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill, Read the third time, and passed.

LONDON PORT AND DOCKS BILL (BY ORDER.)

Order for Second Reading read.

LORD ALWYNE COMPTON (Bedfordshire, Biggleswade) moved that the Order for the Second Reading of the London Port and Docks Bill be discharged and the Bill withdrawn. He said he did so on behalf of the promoters and as a Director of the London and India Docks Company. In 1902 the Government introduced a Bill called the Port of London Bill, which was promoted to purchase the dock companies' undertakings. Since then that Bill had passed through alternate periods of slumber and wakefulness till at last, wearied out, it had fallen asleep altogether. They who represented the trade of the Port of London had always disapproved of the principles on which that Bill was founded, and for that reason they promoted their own private Bill, which they considered carried out better the intentions of the Royal Commission. The President of the Board of Trade constantly told them that the Government Bill was not to be dropped, and for that reason they had postponed, from time to time, their own Bill and gave him all the assistance in their power to pass the Government Bill. They felt they had a grievance in this matter, because they had incurred a great deal of expenditure, on behalf of his company particularly, and also because their Bill, having been postponed so often, had now to be withdrawn. Neither this nor any other Government should interfere directly with trade, as procrastination in this matter had caused a great deal of dislocation of trade.

Order discharged. Bill withdrawn.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Great Eastern Railway Bill; North-Western Electricity and Power Gas Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to—Clyde Valley Electrical Power Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to continue and amend The Light Railways Act, 1896." [Light Railways Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, " An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade, under The Tramways Act, 1870, relating to Altrincham Urban District Council Tramways, Calverley Urban District Council Tramways, Crompton Urban District Council Tramways, Plymouth Corporation Tramways, Rochdale Corporation Tramway, Royton Urban District Council Tramways, and Wardle Urban District Council Tramway." [Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [Lords.]

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under The Gas and Waterworks Facilities Act, 1870, relating to Bradfield Water, Cholderton and District Water, Elham Valley Water, Frimley and Farnborough District Water, and North Sunderland Waterworks." [Water Orders Confimation Bill [Lords.]

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 265.]

Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords] Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 266.]

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; from Aberkenfig; Aley Green; Atherstone; Attleborough (two); Barnes; Bedminster; Buckie; Burton on Trent; Chilvers Coton; Dawley; Desford; Drighlington; East Holywell; Edinburgh (four); Flitwick; Forest Hill; Frenchay; Gaddesden Row; Glasgow; Hartshill (two); Hawes; Hebron; Hoyland Common; Hoyland Nether; Ilford; Lowerhouse; Maidstone; Mickleover; Mylor; Newcastle on Tyne; Notting Hill; Nuneaton (three); Peckham; Peckham Rye; Pentonville; Reading (four); Redcar; Richmond; Snape; Stalybridge; Studham; Thornaby on Tees; Totterdown; Ventnor; Wentworth; Wootton Wawen; and York; to lie upon the Table.

SUNDAY TRADING (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour; from the Royal, Parliamentary, and Police Burghs of Scotland; and Scottish Sabbath Protection Association; to lie upon the Table.

VALUATION BILL.

Petition from Aberayron, for alteration, to lie upon the Table.

VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS ACT, 1897.

Petition from Rochester, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

COUNTY COURTS (PLAINTS AND SITTINGS).

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 30th June; *Mr. Cochrane*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 246.]

POST OFFICE (FOREIGN AND COLONIAL PARCEL POST).

Copy presented, of the Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 9) Warrant, 1904, dated 21st June, 1904 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1884.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 7th July, 1904, declaring that Thomas Galler, skilled labourer, Royal Laboratory, War Office, was appointed without a Civil Service certificate through inadvertence on the part of the head of his Department [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

WHALING AND WHALE-CURING (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of Report of a Departmental Committee appointed by the Secretary for Scotland to inquire into the new Whale and Whale-curing Industry on the coast of Scotland and in the adjacent waters. Vol. II. Minutes of Evidence and Appendix [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of Regulations of the Board of Education, dated 11th July, 1904, providing for grants on account of the Education of Defective and Epileptic Children, and prescribing Conditions to be fulfilled by Certified Schools and Classes for such Children [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

AFRICA (No. 8, 1904).

Copy presented, of Correspondence relating to the Resignation of Sir Charles Eliot and to the Concession to the East Africa Syndicate [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3209 to 3212 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

FISHERIES (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Report of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland on the Sea and Inland Fisheries of Ireland for 1903. Part. I. General Report [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, transferring to the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the borough of Lowestoft the powers conferred upon the East Anglian Light Railways Company by The East Anglian Light Railways Order, 1902, and amending that Order (Lowestoft Corporation (East Anglian Transfer) Light Railways Order, 1904) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways in the city of Ripon and in the rural distict of Ripon, in the West Riding of the county of York (Ripon and District Light Railways Order, 1904) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending the Leek, Caldon Low, and Hartington Light Railways Order, 1898 (Leek, Caldon Low, and Hartington Light Railways (Extension of Time, etc.) Order, 1904) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of a Light Railway from Witney, in the county of Oxford, to Andoversford, in the county of Gloucester (Witney, Burford, and Andoversford, Light Railway Order, 1904) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways in the county of Essex, in the borough of Southend-on-Sea and the urban district of Shoeburyness (Southend-on-Sea and District Light Railways (Extensions) Order, 1904) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Lunacy. Copy of Appendix to the fifty-eighth Report of the Commissioners in Lunacy to the Lord Chancellor [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 247.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Civil Service Retirement Regulations.

MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the Minute of 30th July, 1903, as to retirement at the age of sixty-five, is still operative; if so, whether my Lords are still of opinion that in the case of civil servants on smaller salaries every consideration consistent with the efficiency of the service should be shown; and whether the recent application of the Registrar-General of England for an extension in the case of John M. Millner, an abstractor, has been dealt with in accordance with this clause of the Treasury Minute.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) The paragraph referred to was not intended to be of general application, but to meet a limited class of cases of hardship which arose immediately on the passing of the Order in Council of 29th November, 1898, and which are now not likely to recur.

Return of Parish Charities (Scotland).

MR. HALDANE (Haddingtonshire): To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he will have the Return of Parish Charities (Scotland), dated 19th April, 1894, brought down to date, and state therein the number of beneficiaries among whom these charities were distributed during the year 1903, and the administrative changes, if any, which have been effected under the first four sub-sections of Section 30 of the Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1894, since it came into operation.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) I am prepared to grant the Return desired by the hon. Member. The exact form which it should take will require consideration, and when this has been adjusted I shall communicate with him.

Teaching of Hygiene in Scotch Schools.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether the Scottish Education Department has received a statement from any members of the medical profession, who, in view of the serious physical and moral conditions of degeneracy and disease resulting from the neglect and infraction of the elementary laws of hygiene, desire the Board of Education to consider whether it would be possible to include in the curricula, both of elementary and secondary schools, such teaching as may lead the young to appreciate the value of healthful physical conditions; and whether he will state the intentions of the Department with regard to this representation.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) No representation answering to the description of the hon. Member has been received by the Scotch Education Department. But the subject has been frequently brought before the Department, and is now occupying their attention. I cannot commit the Department to any particular course of action in reply to a Question.

Increase in Number of Aged Poor in Poorhouses in Scotland.

MR. BLACK (Banffshire): To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether his attention has been called to the large increase which has, during the last thirty years, taken place in the proportion of aged poor who are inmates of poorhouses in Scotland as compared with those receiving outdoor relief; whether he has any official information showing that this increase is due to a change of policy, involving aged persons being compelled in greater numbers to go into the poorhouse without the alternative of outdoor relief being offered them; and, if so, will he revert to the former practice of permitting the aged poor to receive relief in their own homes in all cases where they can so arrange.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) I am informed by the Local Government Board that they are not in a position to confirm the statement of the hon. Member in regard to relief of the aged poor. There has been no change of policy on the part of the Board in the direction indicated.

Meal Reliefs in the General Post Office.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that counter clerks stationed at the chief office, London, who commence duty at 6 a.m. and 6.45 a.m. are compelled to take their meal reliefs at 10 a.m. and 10.30 a.m.; that they are prevented by the rules from leaving the building to obtain food, although the official refreshment branch is not open during these hours; and, if so, whether he will inquire into the subject with a view to making an alteration in the meal reliefs.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) The arrangement to which the hon. Member refers was made at the request of the men themselves. A few days ago they asked for an alteration, and I find that their wishes have already been met. It would therefore appear that the information supplied to the hon. Member, and on which he based his Question, conveyed an entirely erroneous impression.

Structural Alterations at Roscrea Post Office—Claim of Mr. Acres.

MR. KENDAL O'BRIEN (Tipperary, Mid.): To ask the Postmaster-General if he will explain why payment of £24 claimed by Mr. Acres, late postmaster, Roscrea, county Tipperary, for structural alterations made by him in the post office there, is refused, whilst he was paid £46 for fittings for said post office supplied at the same time; whether he is aware that these structural alterations include the letter receiver and certain woodwork inside the office; that the Department offered Mr. Acres 2s. per month as long as they required the use of the property, and refused to allow Mr. Acres in January, 1903, to remove this property; and whether, seeing that they are still in use in the post office, will payment of Mr. Acres' claim of £24 be made to him.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) The office fittings were bought by the Department because they can be removed elsewhere, or disposed of when no longer required where they are. With regard to structural alterations the case is different. The premises, including the letter box, woodwork, and other fixtures referred to, were taken as they now stand by the present postmaster, who refused to allow the removal of the fixtures; and the rent includes interest on the amount expended on structural alterations. The precise amount included in the rent for this purpose is 2s. per month; but I understand that Mr. Acres refused to accept this portion of the rent.

Promotion of a Learner in Portadown Post Office.

MR. WOOD; (Down, E.): To ask the Postmaster-General, whether he is aware that a learner with less than a year's service at Portadown has been given charge of the receipt of mails, and deals exclusively with the registered letter work, whilst clerks of many years service are placed in subordinate positions; and, if so, whether, in view of the official evidence given before the Bradford Commission, he will inquire into the matter.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) I am having inquiry made, and I will communicate the result to the hon. Member.

Teaching of Hygiene in Schools.

SIR JOHN LENG: To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education, whether the Board has received a statement from many members of the medical profession who, in view of the serious physical and moral conditions of degeneracy and disease resulting from the neglect and infraction of the elementary laws of hygiene, desire the Board of Education to consider whether it would be possible to include in the curricula, both of elementary and secondary schools, such teaching as may lead the young to appreciate the value of healthful physical conditions; and whether he will state the intentions of the Board with regard to the representation.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) The President of the Board received this afternoon a very influential deputation, introduced by the hon. Member for West Aberdeenshire, who presented a petition signed by over 14,000 members of the medical profession. In reply the President expressed his hearty sympathy with the objects which the deputation had put before him, and detailed the steps which have been, and are being, taken to attain those objects in the training of teachers and other directions.

Status and Pay of Naval School masters.

MR. YOXALL: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if a circular concerning the conditions of recent promotions of naval schoolmasters to be head schoolmasters and head schoolmasters to be chief schoolmasters is to be promulgated; and, if so, when; whether any improvements as to pay, pension, widows' pension, and warrant rank are to be made; and whether it is proposed to improve the *status* and pay of the naval schoolmasters technically so-called.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) A circular letter to the Fleet on the subject of chief and head schoolmasters has been prepared and will be issued shortly. It will contain full particulars of the new commissioned rank of chief schoolmaster. As regards the existing warrant rank of head schoolmaster the number of officers has been increased, their *status* raised, and the scale of widows' pensions improved. Instructional allowances also have been attached to certain appointments open to officers of this grade. Full particulars of these changes will be included in the forthcoming circular letter.

Substitution of Schools for Training Ships.

MR. REGINALD LUCAS (Portsmouth): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether it is proposed to discontinue the training of boys for the Royal Navy on board ship at Portsmouth, and substitute training schools ashore elsewhere.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) The "St. Vincent" being still serviceable there is no present intention to discontinue training on board this ship.

Chinese Labour for the Transvaal—Prohibition by the Chinese Authorities at Canton.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he will state whether the Chinese authorities in the province of Canton prohibited the further recruitment of labourers for the Transvaal for the reason that the recent Anglo-Chinese Convention was being rendered nugatory through the shipment of labourers from the British port of Hong-kong instead of from a Chinese treaty port, as provided in that Convention; and, if not, what was the reason for this prohibition.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) I have no information with regard to the Viceroy's motives.

Powers granted for Electric Power Supply to Districts, Return.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): To ask the President of the Board of Trade when the Return respecting proceedings under Acts granting powers for the supply of electric power to districts, to which he assented on the 8th February last, may be expected to be in the possession of the House.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) The Return is ready, and will be presented immediately.

Infantile Mortality.

SIR WALTER FOSTER: To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, in view of the rate of infantile mortality in many populous districts, he will issue a circular to boards of guardians in the large towns, calling attention to the facts connected with infantile mortality, and pointing out that no difficulty should be made to discourage poor people from applying for early medical aid when they or their children are exposed to danger from epidemic diseases.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) I am advised that the high rate of infantile mortality in large towns is to a considerable extent due to improper feeding, and is by no means confined to children of the pauper class. I am not aware that difficulties are made to discourage poor people, who would be proper recipients of relief, from applying for early medical aid in the circumstances referred to in the Question, but if the hon. Member is aware of cases of the kind, and will furnish me with particulars of them, I shall be happy to make inquiry with regard to them. At present there does not seem to me to be sufficient ground for issuing a circular of the kind suggested.

Position of Debenture Holders of Irish Loan Fund Banks.

DR. THOMPSON (Monaghan, N.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, if his attention has been called to the treatment of the debenture holders of the Irish Loan Fund Banks; is he aware that these depositors were guaranteed against loss by His Majesty's Government, and that notwithstanding they have been paid no interest for years and that their capital cannot now be recovered; that this state of things was produced by the carelessness of a Government Department in Dublin Castle, by the Loan Fund Board of Ireland, and of its Secretary; and if, in view of these circumstances, he is prepared to refund the money thus lost by these debenture holders.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The Question is based on an entire misconception of the facts. The Government has never guaranteed depositors in the Loan Fund Banks against loss. It has been frequently pointed out that the Government accepts no responsibility whatever for any losses that may have been incurred by depositors, and that the Executive exercises no control over the proceedings of the Board or the individual societies working in connection with that Board. The reply to the Question is consequently in the negative. The Bill now before the House is intended to facilitate the collection of money due to the societies, and should it become law the position of debenture holders of insolvent societies will be materially improved.

The Irish Estates Commissioners.

DR. THOMPSON: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been called to the amount of work in the office of the Estates Commissioners, and that, notwithstanding, the Commissioners have issued directions to their inspectors that in estimating the value of non-judicial rents they are to carefully inspect and tabulate in detail the different farms, noting all the improvements; and, if so, whether he will consider the desirability of allowing an inspector to inspect the estate as a whole and furnish his report without entering so much into minute particulars.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The Estates Commissioners have not issued any instructions of the character mentioned in the Question.

Irish Poor Law Medical Officers' Superannuation Bill.

DR. THOMPSON: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that the Irish Poor Law Medical Officers' Superannuation Bill has the support of nearly the whole body of Irish Members; and, if so, considering the importance of this Bill, he will consent to make it a Government measure and pass it into law this session.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) No, sir; I am not aware that the fact is as stated. I have more than once expressed the opinion that I should be glad to see a Bill become law that was designed to effect a settlement of the question of superannuation upon a basis fair and equitable and acceptable to all parties proposed to be affected. But the Bill before the House would not attain these objects. In my correspondence with the Poor Law Association I suggested the reconstruction of the measure upon a basis that would stand the test of actuarial criticism. Until this has been done the Government cannot consider the question of providing facilities for the passage of the Bill.

Erection of Labourer's Cottage for William Carroll in the Cashel Rural District.

MR. CONDON (Tipperary, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a labourer named William Carroll applied to the Cashel Rural District Council for a labourer's cottage and plot; that his representation was passed by the council and also passed at the inquiry held by the Local Government inspector; that no opposition was offered at the inquiry; that an arbitrator was appointed and his award made; that when all this had been done an objection was made by a Mr. Hemphill on the ground that he was not served with the statutory notice; and whether, seeing that no steps have since been taken to build the cottage, and in view of the size of the hut in which this man and his family are living, the Local Government Board will take steps to have the cottage erected.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The facts are as stated. The Local Government Board is not, however, empowered to take steps to have the cottage erected in view of mistake made by the district council in the service of the requisite notices on the persons interested in the plot. It is a matter for the council to consider whether it might not be able to come to terms with the owner and occupier for the taking of the site, or of an alternative site on their lands.

The Sherlock Estate, County Cork.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork County, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the tenants on the Sherlock Estate, Ballyrobin, Cloyne, county Cork, which is at present in the Land Judge's Court, will be afforded an opportunity of purchasing their holdings.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) It is necessary to communicate with the solicitor having carriage of the proceedings for the sale of this estate, and I would ask the hon. Member to postpone the Question till Thursday next.

Manufacture of Rifles in Government and Private Factories.

MR. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe): To ask the Secretary of State for War what number of the service rifles, Lee-Metford and Lee-Enfield, were made at the Royal Small Arms Factory, Enfield, during the years 1889–1890, 1890–1891, 1891–2, 1892–3, 1893–4; what was the cost per rifle each year; what number of Lee-Metford and Lee-Enfield rifles were made at the Royal Small Arms Factory, Birmingham, during the same period, and what was the cost per rifle for each year; what was the number of these rifles made at the London Small Arms Factory, Old Ford, during the same period, and what was the cost per rifle each year respectively; and will he state if the cost of establishment, depreciation of plant and machinery, are included in the cost of the rifle at Enfield, whether wages at Enfield are higher than at any other small arms factory, and whether a large amount of sub-contracting exists at the present time at the private firms, resulting in the employment of a number of men by sub-contractors at low wages.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The number of service rifles made at Enfield and Birmingham for the years in question, and their cost, were as follows:—

	Enfield Lock.		Birmingham.	
	Number.	Price.	Number.	Price.
		£ s. d.		£ s. d.
1889–90 - - -	31,238	5 5 0½	4,395	5 18 4
1890–91 - - -	92,127	3 11 10¼	26,957	3 14 5
1891–2 - - -	42,407	3 11 0	25,837	3 9 2
1892–3 - - -	35,240	3 14 6½	13,633	3 17 4¼
1893–4 - - -	32,945	3 10 4	15,870	3 14 9

The number made by the London Small Arms Company in the same period was 75,000, and the price per rifle for the first half of the contract was £5 10s., and for the second half £4 18s. The cost of establishment and depreciation of plant and machinery are included in the cost of the rifle at Enfield. As regards wages at Enfield, when the difference of rates of wages in different districts and of the scheme of manufacturing in each factory are taken into consideration, the run of wages for rifle work is not higher than at Sparkbrook, but, if anything, it may be said to be rather lower. The rate of wages paid by private firms is not known. There is no sub-contracting at the present time of which the War Department is aware.

Officers warned for Removal from Salisbury.

SIR WALTER PALMER (Salisbury): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether any officer or any member of the staff attached to or belonging to the division at Salisbury has received official notice to be ready to leave Salisbury this year; and, if so, whether such notice is definite, or merely precautionary.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) Notice of prospective removal, to take place on the 30th September, was given; but, as it appeared probable that inconvenience and expense might be caused by the shortness of the notice, the move has been postponed until the 31st December.

Promotion in the Royal Army Medical Corps.

DR. THOMPSON: To ask the Secretary of State for War if he is aware of the dissatisfaction existing amongst the officers of the Royal Army Medical Corps at the recent promotions, whereby twelve senior officers were passed over in favour of a younger officer of less distinguished service than some of those whose claims were rejected; and if, in future, he will direct the Advisory Board to give their reasons for their selections and communicate them if requested to the officers passed over.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The Secretary of State is not aware of the dissatisfaction amongst the officers of the Royal Army Medical Corps alleged in the Question. Promotions are made by selection and after careful inquiry by the Advisory and Selection Boards. The standard upon which the Advisory Board bases its recommendations is that of positive merit, and suitability for the Administrative Medical Staff of the Army. It would not appear desirable that reasons for supersession should be communicated to the officers affected.

Tenders for Meat for Ballykinlor Camp.

MR. WOOD: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the fact that tenders were asked for the supply of butcher's meat for the camp at Ballykinlor from the 1st June to the 1st December, 1904, he will say who were the parties who tendered for same, and the prices at which they tendered, and explain why the lowest tender was not accepted.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The General Officer Commanding the 9th Division sent out the tenders referred to and is authorised to accept or decline all such tenders.

Disturbances amongst Chinese Labourers at Tientsin.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can now give an account of a conflict in Tientsin between two batches of Chinese indentured labourers awaiting embarkation for the Transvaal mines, under the provisions of the Chinese Labour Ordinance, the casualties already reported being three Chinamen killed and twenty wounded; and whether, having regard to the fact that the combatants at Tientsin were natives of North China and South China between whom a deadly feud exists, any provision has been made to prevent similar collisions during the voyage to South Africa and in the mines; if he has received a telegraphic report of this occurrence, why has he not communicated that report to the House of Commons; if he has not received such report, what steps does he intend to take with reference to the delay.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) I received a telegram from the Transvaal Government Agent at Tientsin on 22nd June, stating that the deaths occurred as a result of a street brawl on a large scale which originated between two bodies of Chinese emigrants living in different quarters of the town, and that there was no reason to apprehend that there will be trouble on the ships; that the contending parties would be carried on different ships; and that a despatch will follow by mail. I expected the hon. Member by repeating his Question as he has now done to enable me to give the information to the House.

Salaries and Fees of Law Officers of the Crown—Opportunity for Discussion.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether in view of the fact that no discussion was permitted in the session of 1903 on the salaries and fees of the Law Officers of the Crown, and having regard to the fact that the amendment to the law regarding the publication of false balance-sheets promised by the Prime Minister on the 19th February, 1903, is indefinitely postponed, he will undertake that full opportunity will be given during the present session of Parliament for discussing the salaries and fees paid to the Law Officers of the Crown amounting to £32,990 7s.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) In view of important Estimates which have not yet been before the Committee of Supply, I can give no pledge to put down the Vote mentioned by the hon. Member. I may remind him that the False Statements (Companies) Bill was introduced in the House of Commons on 25th February of this year in pursuance of the undertaking given by the Government. It is, however, evident from the Notices on the Paper that the Bill cannot be regarded as uncontroversial.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

H.M.S. "Centurion"—Defective Gun Sights.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, can he state what is the prize-firing record last received of H.M.S. "Centurion," and whether the Board of Admiralty consider it to be satisfactory; have the Admiralty received any report from Admiral Sir Cyprian Bridge, as Commander-in-Chief on the China Station, to the effect that H.M.S. "Centurion" was unfit to go into action by reason of her defective gun sights; and can he say what steps have since been taken to remedy the defects, and when the Admiralty expect that H.M.S. "Centurion" will be fit to go into action.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): The prize-firing records are confidential; but it may be stated that the "Centurion's" firing was not as good as on a former occasion referred to in my reply to the hon. Member for Caithness on 18th April.† That reply covers all the points raised in this Question.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: The latter part of my Question is not covered by that Answer.

MR. PRETYMAN: The Admiralty do not admit that the "Centurion" is not fit to go into action.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Have any steps been taken to remedy the defects?

MR. PRETYMAN: It was stated on a former occasion that improvements and alterations are constantly being made in the sighting and fittings, and when a ship is on a foreign station it is impossible to say at a given moment whether her sights have been altered.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Is the "Centurion" fit to go into action?

MR. PRETYMAN: Yes, Sir.

H.M.S. "Prince of Wales"—Sight Fittings.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, in view of the fact that the sight fittings of H.M.S. "Prince of Wales" are not what would be supplied now, will he state what sight fittings would be supplied now; and has any decision been arrived at as regards the best form of sights and sight fittings either for turret guns or for 6 inch guns.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxiii., 359.

MR. PRETYMAN: The details asked for in the first part of the Question cannot be given in reply to a Parliamentary Question. A decision has been arrived at as to what is at present regarded as the best form of sights for turrets and 6-inch guns, but there is no such thing as finality in this matter.

Alteration on Ships of War—King's Regulations.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty are the ship's artificers of H.M.S. "Prince of Wales" engaged in fitting cross connections to the ship's 6-inch gun sights and in fitting large range discs; and, in view of Art. 1319 of the King's Regulations, prescribing that proposals for alterations and additions shall be made by letter, were any such proposals made by letter before the alterations were carried out.

MR. PRETYMAN: They may be doing so; inquiry can be made if desired. Article 1319 of the King's Regulations does not refer to such alterations as these, but to large alterations that are proposed to be made by a dockyard, and consequently require special approval.

In reply to a further Question, MR. PRETYMAN said the commanders of ships were encouraged to carry out these smaller alterations themselves, and a letter was not necessary in such a case as this.

Transvaal Labour Ordinance.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will cable to Lord Milner and ascertain whether the Law Officers of the Transvaal Government construe the Chinese Ordinance as permitting Chinese labourers to do mining work formerly performed by white miners; also, if Chinese labourers are to-day employed at the Comet Mine as overseers, and if they are under the direction and supervision of white gangers; and, if so, are these Chinese overseers additional and supplemental hands to the staff of the mines, seeing that Kaffir overseers or gangers have never been employed in the Transvaal mines except under white miners.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. LYTTELTON, Warwick and Leamington): It does not seem to me to be desirable or necessary to telegraph as proposed by the hon. Member. The terms of the Ordinance appear to me to be plain in confining these labourers to unskilled labour, which is defined as that usually performed in the mines by natives. I am not informed as to the exact arrangements which have been made in the Comet Mine, but I will inquire.

The Chinese Exclusion Bill in Cape Colony.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the assent of the Crown, withheld from the Chinese Exclusion Bill by the Governor of Cape Colony for the consideration of the Colonial Office, has yet been given; and to what is the delay in giving that assent due, if it has not yet been given, having regard to the presence in this country of the Governor of Cape Colony,

MR. LYTTELTON: No, Sir; there is nothing unusual in the delay It is usual to sanction reserved Bills by Order in Council, and, as I informed the hon. Member a week ago, the authenticated copy of the law only reached me on the 2nd instant.

Desertions from the Coolie Camp in Johannesburg.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has any official information showing that two colonial coolies imported to the Rand under the Chinese Labour Ordinance have deserted from the New Comet Mine, Johannesburg, and were captured on Wednesday last at Pretoria, having tramped thither from Johannesburg; can he say whether they were escorted to Johannesburg by military or by police, and were they handcuffed; what was the reason for their desertion, and what will be the punishment accorded to them; and whether there is any explanation of the circumstance that they have, within a few days of entrance on their work as indentured labourers, thus deserted from it.

Mr. LYTTELTON: I have no information on the subject.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: Will the right hon. Gentleman use the cable? Is he aware that there is a telegraph to South Africa?

Mr. LYTTELTON: Yes, Sir, I am quite aware that there is a telegraph, but I do not consider it necessary to employ it.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: I also beg to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he has sent a despatch by the last mail to Lord Milner calling his attention to the fact that these two coolies had escaped from this mine, and inquiring how they escaped and how they were brought back?

Mr. LYTTELTON said he had not written to Lord Milner.

*Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware it is reported that a large number of Chinese coolies have escaped?

Mr. SPEAKER: A Question must not be based on reports.

Great Britain and Tibet—Chinese Rights.

Mr. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India what is our precise position towards China in regard to Tibet; is Tibet an independent kingdom or is it a portion of the Chinese Empire; has the representative of China in Tibet full powers from his Government to enter into a treaty with us; and, if so, would this treaty be valid before being ratified by the Chinese Government in Pekin; or have we—assuming Tibet to be a dependency of China—obtained any assurance from the Chinese authorities that if we sign a treaty with Tibet such treaty would be binding on China.

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford): For information regarding the *status* of Tibet I must refer the hon. Member to the Blue-book. The negotiations will be conducted jointly with the Chinese Amban and the Tibetan representatives. The Chinese Government has been kept duly apprised of the action of His Majesty's Government in Tibet, and the Chinese Amban at Lhasa expressed to Colonel Younghusband, on his arrival at Gyangtse, his readiness to negotiate.

Mr. LABOUCHERE: Are we at war with China or not?

Mr. BRODRICK: I think that Question has been repeatedly answered. It does not arise on this Question so far as I can gather.

Assistant Military Secretary for Indian Affairs.

Captain NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if he can state when the appointment of Assistant Military Secretary for Indian Affairs is likely to be filled up.

Mr. BRODRICK: The appointment in question has been abolished.

Regent of Zanzibar.

Mr. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, seeing that a deputation from Zanzibar recently came to England to complain of the proceedings of the Regent, he will state if the Regent is now at Zanzibar or on leave of absence; and, if not, will he say with whom has the Government been in correspondence regarding the matters complained of by the Envoy.

The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.): The Regent is at Zanzibar. I have already stated that His Majesty's Government has been in communication with the Sultan and with the Regent.

Stoppage of British Mail Steamers by Russian Warships.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any inquiry has been made as to the circumstances under which a British mail steamer was recently stopped in the Red Sea by a Russian man-of-war; whether the man-of-war issued from and returned to neutral ports; whether there is reason to believe that she had coaled in a neutral port since having coaled in a Russian port; and whether any protest has been made either to any neutral Power or to the Russian Government on the subject.

EARL PERCY: His Majesty's Government have received no information of the stoppage of any British mail steamer recently in the Red Sea. In February last two steamers of the Peninsular and Oriental Company and one of the Indian Steam Navigation Company were stopped by the Russian squadron in the Red Sea, and in two cases the vessel was boarded and its papers examined, but in each case after a very short detention it was allowed to proceed. There was nothing in these cases which would have justified any protest on the part of His Majesty's Government.

Rule of the Road at Sea—Board of Trade Warning.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade, have the Board of Trade issued a notice or warning to merchant ships to the effect that when meeting vessels of His Majesty's Fleet they should keep out of the way of such vessels; if so, will he state its date and terms; does the notice practically suspend and supersede on such an occasion the ordinary rule of the road at sea as between ship and ship; does it apply to foreign as well as to British merchant ships; and do the Board of Trade propose to adhere to or withdraw such notice.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): (1) In April, 1897, the Board of Trade issued a notice to shipowners and masters calling attention to the danger to all concerned which is caused by single vessels approaching a squadron of warships so closely as to involve risk of collision, or attempting to pass ahead of, or through, or to break the line of, such squadrons. Mariners were warned that on such occasions it would be in the interests of safety for single ships to adopt timely measures to keep out of the way of, and avoid passing through, a squadron. This notice was re-issued in July, 1900, with reference to the judgments delivered in the Court of Appeal in the "Sanspareil" case. (2) The notice is advisory only and does not suspend or supersede the rule of the road at sea. (3) It was not addressed to owners or masters of foreign ships; and (4) as at present advised I am not prepared to withdraw it.

Stony Stratford Postmastership—War Services Rewarded.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he will explain why a candidate was appointed to the postmastership of Stony Stratford who had only eighteen years service, seeing that other candidates applied with considerably over twenty years approved service; and whether, in view of the weekly notice in the Post Office Circular that outside influence should not be employed in seeking appointments, he will state whether any recommendations other than official were considered in this case, and what steps he proposes to take.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): The postmaster was appointed by me because I considered him the most suitable of the candidates. He was not only strongly recommended by his official superiors, but he had also rendered special service in South Africa during the War. He was mentioned in despatches for continuous and marked good service, and his name was officially brought to the Postmaster-General's notice in 1902 by Lord Kitchener's orders. No outside or unofficial recommendations were brought before me or considered.

MR. NANNETTI inquired if it were not against the rules for civil servants to receive testimonials from distinguished individuals outside.

LORD STANLEY: It is nothing against a man that he should receive such a testimonial as this officer did from Lord Kitchener.

Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories and Workshops.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Home

Department what is the cause of the unusual delay in the publication of the Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories and Workshops.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. COCHRANE, Ayrshire, N.): I explained, in answer to a Question of the right hon. Baronet on the same subject last March,† the special circumstances which made it impossble to promise this year's Report at so early a date as last year's. Every effort, however, has been made to expedite the printing of the Report, and I understand that copies will be delivered on Friday next.

Alien Pauper Lunatics and Convicts.

SIR WALTER GREENE (Bury St. Edmunds): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can state how many pauper alien lunatics are known to be at present maintained at public expense within the Metropolitan area, and whether there has been any, and what, increase in the number of such persons during the last five years; and whether he can state how many alien convicts are at the present time confined in convict prisons, and whether he can state the number of aliens who were during the year 1903 confined in local prisons.

MR. COCHRANE: Inquiry is being made as regards the pauper alien lunatics, and if the information desired can be obtained it will be communicated to the hon. Member. The number of aliens in convict prisons on 23rd April, 1904, was 182. The number confined in local prisons on conviction during the year ended 31st March, 1903, was, 3,449. These are the latest dates for which information is available; and it is impossible to obtain fresh statistics without an examination of the prison records, which would involve considerable time and labour.

Agricultural Profits in Great Britain.

MR. EUGENE WASON (Clackmannan and Kinross): I beg to ask the hon. Member for North Huntingdonshire, as representing the Board of Agriculture, whether he can state approximately the annual profit made by proprietors farming their own land, tenant farmers, and holders of allotments in Great Britain during the year ending 31st March last.

MR. AILWYN FELLOWES (Huntingdonshire, Ramsey): I regret that we are not in possession of information which would enable the Board even approximately to estimate the annual profit made by the various classes of occupiers of agricultural land to which the hon. Member refers.

Ordnance Survey Department Discipline.

MR. NANNETTI: I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether he is aware that a temporary civil assistant in the Ordnance Survey Department has been reduced by the sum of 3d. per day by the divisional officer for visiting, without permission, his wife, who was dangerously ill; and whether, under the circumstances, he will take the case into his consideration, and restore to this man his position and pay.

MR. AILWYN FELLOWES: Inquiries into the case mentioned have been instituted, but the information necessary to enable me to reply to the Question is not yet available. Perhaps the hon. Member would put it down again in a day or two's time.

Admiralry Courtyard, Whitehall.

GENERAL LAURIE (Pembroke and Haverfordwest): I beg to ask the hon. Member for Chorley, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, whether his attention has been called to the wooden or plaster shutters which have been placed behind the open work of the architectural screen which connects the gateway leading into the Admiralty Courtyard, Whitehall; and whether he could propose to the First Commissioner of Works to remove these shutters and allow the whole screen to be seen and appreciated.

LORD BALCARRES: (Lancashire, Chorley): The answer to the first paragraph is in the affirmative. It appears that the wooden shutters referred to have been in existence for many years. The First Commissioner is considering the possibility of removing them.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxii., 618.

Rathmines Register.

MR. MOONEY (Dublin County, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland if he has now received the police report relative to the tampering with the requisition forms in the Rathmines polling district of South Dublin; and what steps he proposes to take in the matter.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): The police have not as yet been able to establish the identity of the persons who collected and tampered with these forms, but they are pursuing their inquiries. I am informed that the town clerk has already taken steps to counteract the attempt to falsify the register, and that the correct names of the voters will be inserted in the lists.

Kingstown and Dalkey Voters Lists.

MR. MOONEY: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland if his attention has been called to complaints from the Kingstown and Dalkey polling districts of South Dublin as to the tampering with the voters' requisition forms by the agents of a certain organisation; and whether, if a list of these agents, together with a list of such forms altered by them without authority, is placed before him, he will direct a prosecution to take place; and whether he proposes to take any, and, if so, what action to secure that these inaccuracies should be corrected, and the persons entitled, and these only, placed on the supplemental list.

MR. ATKINSON: My attention has been called to the matter. The town clerks of Kingstown and Dalkey state that no complaints have been made to them on the subject, and the latter gentleman further states that he is certain that no forms were tampered with in his district. I shall be thankful, however, to the hon. Member for any information he may be good enough to furnish me with, calculated to aid the police in the inquiries they are now making on the subject.

MR. MOONEY: I will supply the right hon. Gentleman with information.

Transfer of Powers from Irish Harbour Authorities to County Councils.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will introduce a short Bill this session giving the Irish Local Government Board power, by Provisional Order, to transfer to a county council any of the powers, duties, and liabilities of any harbour commissioners or trustees (except the commissioners of Royal harbours) in cases where such a transfer is agreed to both by the county council and by the trustees or Commissioners.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): I stated on the 1st inst. that further legislation is unnecessary.† In the case of Courtown Harbour, to which I understand the Question is intended to refer, I am informed that, inasmuch as it is administered by a public body, the transfer of its powers to the county council can be effected by Provisional Order under the 20th Section of the Act of 1898. The Local Government Board would be prepared to make a Provisional Order forthwith and without local inquiry upon receiving a formal resolution to that effect from the county council and the written consent of the harbour trustees to the proposed transfer.

Fisheries on South-East Coast of Ireland.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is in a position to state the result of his inquiries into the condition of the fishing industry on the south-east coast of Ireland, and what he proposes to do for the assistance of that industry.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Question has reference to the application of Section 11 of the Marine Works Act to the maintenance of fishery piers in non-congested districts. The matter is still engaging consideration, and I am not yet in a position to make any statement in respect to it.

Dr. Starkie and Irish Intermediate Schools.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN (Kilkenny, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the

---

† See page 318.

Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state if Dr. Starkie, the Resident Commissioner of National Education in Ireland, was authorised to accompany Messrs. Dale and Stevens on their visits to Irish intermediate schools.

Mr. WYNDHAM: Dr. Starkie is one of the Commissioners of Intermediate Education. He accompanied Messrs. Dale and Stevens at their request.

Derrygoolan Shooting Rights.

Mr. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.): On behalf of the hon. Member for East Galway, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state at whose request the police accompanied strangers on the lands of Derrygoolan in 1902 and 1903 when these strangers were attempting to shoot over the tenants' farms, held from year to year for a great number of years; and if these tenants requisition the services of the police on the 12th August next to assist them in preventing persons shooting their game without permission their request will be complied with, and a sufficient police force be supplied to prevent a breach of the law.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The police, so far as I am aware, received no request and no orders to attend. They had reason to apprehend a breach of the peace and attended to prevent serious violence. It is their duty to prevent violence; but not to prejudice the case of either of the parties claiming the same right. Such claims can only be determined by process of law, that is by one or other of the parties suing either for trespass or for technical assault.

Mr. KILBRIDE: The right hon. Gentleman must be aware that in the case of a tenant from year to year he has as much right to the game as any landlord in this House has to the game on his estate.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The whole thing depends on the nature of the occupation, and that can only be determined in a Court of Law.

Mr. KILBRIDE: Does the right hon. Gentleman deny that they are tenants from year to year?

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): How was it the police attended without a request.

Mr. WYNDHAM: They apprehended that there was going to be a row.

Moy Nationalist Demonstration,

Mr. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether facilities will be given to contingents attending the Nationalist demonstration at Moy, county Tyrone, on 15th August to proceed by the road leading from Trew and Moy Station.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I am informed by the authorities locally responsible that a Nationalist procession through the district in question, which is almost exclusively Orange, would be calculated to endanger the preservation of the peace and would, in all probability, lead to rioting and serious disturbance. Such processions have always hitherto proceeded by the route from Dungannon and Annaghmore, and the Government is unable to entertain any arrangement which contemplates a departure from the route which has been safely followed in former years.

Mr. MACVEAGH: How did the local authorities arrive at the conclusion that this is an Orange district in view of the fact that there are only two Orangemen in the whole neighbourhood. Why is not the procession to be allowed to take this route?

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! That Question has been answered.

Irish Land Purchase—Granville Knox Estate, County Mayo.

Mr. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received from the Ballina District Council a memorial signed by the tenantry of the Granville H. Knox Estate, Crossmolina, county Mayo, which is announced to be sold by public auction in Ballina, on the 13th inst., by order of Judge Ross; and, if so, will he state the circumstances of this sale, and say whether, as this estate contains waste land suitable for the enlargement of small holdings, steps will be taken to give effect to the prayer of memorialists by having this untenanted land purchased for the purpose of enlarging the uneconomic holdings on the untenanted portions proposed to be sold.

MR. WYNDHAM: The sale by auction has been adjourned by the Land Judge to enable the Estates Commissioners to determine whether they will make an offer for the lands.

Labourers Acts—Cost of Providing Additional Land.

MR. O'SHEE (Waterford, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will cause inquiries to be made of all the clerks of rural district councils in whose districts additional half-acres have been already provided under the Labourers Acts, so as to obtain from each rural district an estimate of the average cost of providing an additional half acre, specifying price of land, cost of fencing, legal expenses, and general expenses.

MR. WYNDHAM: An effort will be made to procure this information. But it will, I understand, be very troublesome to collect and will impose much additional labour upon clerks of rural district councils.

Evicted Tenants in County Galway.

MR. KILBRIDE: On behalf of the hon. Member for East Galway, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the number of evicted tenants in the county of Galway who have applied to the Estates Commissioners for reinstatement; how many have been restored; and what has been done either to reinstate the remainder or put them into new holdings.

MR. WYNDHAM: 281 applications have been received. Forty-one have been referred to inspectors to report on. None have as yet been reinstated.

MR. KILBRIDE: Have any untenanted lands been purchased in county Galway?

MR. WYNDHAM: I should like to have notice of that Question, if it is desired to press it; but I may say I have little to add to the statement I made on this subject last Friday.†

Warren's Court Estate, County Cork.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the offer for sale of the Warren's Court Estate, at Kilmurray, county Cork, under the Land Act of 1903, he will state the terms asked by the landlord, and whether they have been agreed to by the tenants; have any representations been received by the Estates Commissioners from Denis Murphy, an evicted tenant; and, if so, whether, seeing that the present occupant of the evicted holding, a man named Kingston, has expressed his willingness to leave it on payment of a fair compensation, the Estates Commissioners will use their good offices towards the reinstatement of the evicted tenant, seeing that both the landlord and his agent are willing to agree to it provided the present occupant can be got to leave.

MR. WYNDHAM: No application has been made to the Estates Commissioners in the case of the Warren Estate. An application for reinstatement has been received from Denis Murphy.

Salters' Company's Trust in Magherafelt.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that in 1899 the Salters' Company, of London, conveyed to certain trustees in Magherafelt, county Derry, the old Courthouse and bridewell, the markets, and certain other property, to hold in trust for the town of Magherafelt upon certain conditions; and that, apart from an annual payment of £120 to two local schools and the handing over £100 to the Magherafelt Gas Company, no other disbursements have been made by the trustees; and whether, in view of the desire of the inhabitants that the money in the hands of the trustees should be spent for the benefit and improvement of the town, a local inquiry will be ordered in order to ascertain the conditions under which the trust was made over, its present value, and the best means of securing that it shall be administered for the benefit and according to the wish of the people of Magherafelt.

---

† See page 1131.

Mr. WYNDHAM: As far as I have been able to ascertain, the Salters' Company assigned certain property to trustees to be used for certain purposes. This trust has been faithfully carried out. I have no power whatever to institute such an inquiry as suggested, or to compel owners of property to dedicate it to purposes other than those to which they desire to devote it.

Wicklow Canteen Licence—Action of Mr. Shanks.

Mr. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Lord Chancellor of Ireland has considered the action of Mr. James Shanks in signing a licence certificate for a canteen situated in the county Wicklow, Mr. Shanks not being a magistrate for that county, and the local magistrates having refused to grant the licence on the ground that the canteen had been conducted in a disorderly manner; and whether he can now state what decision the Lord Chancellor has come to in regard to Mr. Shanks' action.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I am in communication with the Lord Chancellor in this matter, and will ask the hon. Member to repeat the Question on Wednesday.

Proselytising Practices in Kinsale—Complaint against Commander Salwey.

Mr. CREAN (Cork County, S.E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that E. Salwey, Commander R.N., Divisional Office, Kinsale, who lately distributed tracts at the Cork Post Office, is constantly engaged in this and other proselytising practices in the town and district of Kinsale; and, in view of the fact that the annual training of the Naval Reserve, mainly composed of Catholic fishermen and sailors, is under his command, he will have him immediately removed from the district.

Mr. PRETYMAN: This matter has already engaged the attention of the Rear-Admiral Commanding at Queenstown, and the Board of Admiralty are awaiting his report.

Phœnix Park, Dublin—Traders' Vans.

Mr. CLANCY (Dublin County, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether his attention has been called to the action of the Board of Works in Ireland in refusing traders permission to send their vans through the Phœnix Park, Dublin, for the purpose of delivering goods to customers within the Park; whether he is aware that within the last few weeks a trader named Mr. Henry Baggot has been refused such permission, although he furnished, in reply to a demand from the Board, the names of the customers within the ambit of the Park whom he habitually supplied with goods; and, if so, will he say what was the reason for so treating him; and who is responsible for the regulations in virtue of which such restraints are put on trade and business.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY of the TREASURY (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.): Yes, Sir. I am aware of the circumstances. It is necessary in order to preserve the amenity of the Phœnix Park as a place of public enjoyment to restrict its use by carts, vans, and business vehicles as far as possible. But passes are granted to tradesmen and others who can show that their business requires it. The Board of Works are satisfied that the business of Mr. Baggot in the Park is not of such a character as to justify the grant of a pass.

Mr. CLANCY: Are we to understand that the right of a driver to go through the Park depends on the Board of Works being satisfied as to the number of his customers?

Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH: Yes, Sir. The Board of Works have to take that into consideration.

Harcourt Road, Dublin—Sub-Postmaster's Salary

Mr. NANNETTI: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General why the increase of salary which accrued to the town sub-postmaster of Harcourt Road, Dublin, in May, 1902, was withheld.

LORD STANLEY: I find that in 1902, owing to the salary of the Harcourt *Street* Post Office having been inadvertently entered on a return relating to the Harcourt *Road* Office, an increase of £4 4s. a year then due for salary at the latter was unfortunately withheld. I have given instructions for the matter to be at once adjusted.

The Cut, Mountmellick, Queen's County.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that the road known as the Cut, near Clonaslee, Mountmellick, Queen's county has, by order of the military authorities, been closed, thereby causing loss to the residents in the removal of peat fuel from the adjoining bogs; and, if so, will he say whether, before this step was taken, the provisions of the Military Lands Act, 1892, were complied with, and will he give the particulars of what was done, the notices served, the reports received, the persons from whom they were received; and whether steps will be taken to ensure that these people shall not be inconvenienced in securing fuel at the only season in which it is possible for them to do so.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Mr. BROMLEY DAVENPORT, Cheshire, Macclesfield): The road in question is not closed. It was closed for five days while firing took place in the vicinity. No complaints were received, but as soon as it became known that traffic might be interfered with, the road was re-opened and arrangements were made by which firing could take place without interfering with the road. It is regretted that through an error the provisions of the Military Lands Act were not complied with.

Longford Infirmary Committee and Military Patients.

SIR CARNE RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the action of the Longford Infirmary Committee at their last quarterly meeting, when the officer commanding, having requested that emergency cases should be treated there owing to the military hospital being closed, was refused, on the ground that the cases might be those of Englishmen, and also that no decent farmer could be in the same ward with a soldier; and, if so, what provision has been made for such cases of accident and emergency as may occur among the troops there quartered.

MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: The attention of the Secretary of State was first drawn to the matter by this Question. As the military hospital at Longford is fully equipped with a civil practitioner in charge, no question arises as regards the adequate treatment of any emergency or other cases. The alleged gratuitous insult to the British soldier by the Longford Infirmary Committee would hardly, therefore, appear to deserve further consideration.

The State and the Unemployed.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will make a statement before the recess, to the House, as to what action he proposes to take, if any, with regard to advising the various Departments of the State during the recess to deal efficiently with the unemployed, which are an increasing number in the United Kingdom.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): Before my right hon. friend answers this Question, may I ask him if he has considered the influence on the state of affairs indicated in the Question of the hon. Member for Woolwich, as to the increasing number of unemployed in the United Kingdom, of free competing imports without reciprocity, and the unrestricted immigration of destitute aliens?

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): Without travelling over the wide field suggested by my hon. and gallant friend, I may say, in answer to the hon. Gentleman opposite, that this question is constantly under the consideration of the Local Government Board, and the hon. Member may be quite sure that there will be no neglect of it on the part of His Majesty's Government.

MR. FLAVIN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that thousands of white men now unemployed in London would be prepared to go to work in the Transvaal mines if they were guaranteed 10s. a day?

Thames Barrage Scheme and National Foreshore Reclamation.

MR. CROOKS: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will appoint a Departmental Committee to consider the practicability of the Thames barrage scheme, and also the advisability of formulating a scheme of national foreshore reclamation, with a view of providing useful work for the unemployed.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The two proposals referred to in this Question do not appear to be very closely allied, and in any case I am advised that neither scheme seems at present to present features which would justify the appointment of a Departmental Committee.

MR. CROOKS: Then we are not even to have an inquiry whether they would or not?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think the hon. Gentleman will admit that there must be a strong *prima facie* case for putting the officials of a Department to the labour of such an inquiry, and I rather gather that that *prima facie* case has not been made out.

The Coaling of Belligerent Warships at English Coaling Stations.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, have His Majesty's Government considered the conditions that should be attached to granting permission, during war, to belligerent men-of-war for coaling in coaling stations of His Majesty's dominions within or beyond the seas; and have they especially considered the necessity for requiring, as a condition precedent to granting such permission, a satisfactory engagement that any belligerent man-of-war allowed to be supplied with sufficient coal to carry her to the nearest port of her own nation will in fact proceed to that port direct, and will not use the coal supplied for proceeding elsewhere, in order to carry on operations of war against the other belligerent.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: This question has engaged the attention of the Government, and directions have been given for carrying out the condition to which my hon. friend refers in the last lines of his Question.

The Licensing Bill.

MR. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he will state what provisions the Government propose to insert in the Licensing Bill providing that adequate penalties shall be imposed on those publicans who do not provide reasonable refreshment for the public, and also for those who do not comply with the reasonable requirements of the magistrates.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: If the hon. Gentleman will look at the Amendments on the Paper he will see that both his points are met by those standing in the name of the Solicitor-General.

The Aliens Bill.

MR. FORDE RIDLEY (Bethnal Green, S.W.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if his attention has been called to the Report of the Standing Committee on the Aliens Bill, and to the decision of the Committee that it is useless, in view of the large number of Amendments put down against the Bill, to proceed further with its consideration during the present session; and if he will undertake to reintroduce it early next session.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: From what I can hear of the proceedings in Committee upon this Bill, it received treatment which would make it absolutely impossible to carry it into law during the course of the present session. I understand that the average rate of progress was two lines in a day. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Three lines in six days."] I beg pardon: three lines in six days, or half a line a day. I have not made the arithmetical calculation as to the length of time it would have taken in Grand

Committee had the same rate of progress been maintained on all the clauses of the Bill; but I think it will be obvious that the Committee had absolutely no choice, in the face of the treatment which the Bill received, but to take the course they actually did take. My hon. friend asks me for a pledge that the Government will reintroduce the Bill early next session. We shall certainly attempt to deal with this subject early next session; but of course it would be quite impossible for me to go beyond the general terms of that pledge and to give any detailed pledge on the subject.

*MAJOR EVANS-GORDON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney) asked if they might take it that it was the definite intention of the Government to reintroduce the Bill next session.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am sorry I was not clearly heard by my hon. friend. The Government do propose to introduce a Bill on this subject early next session.

*MR. PEEL (Manchester, S.) asked the right hon. Gentleman a Question of which he had given private notice, whether, in view of the fact that a small body of obstructives [Cries of "Order"]——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! A Question of that sort should be brought to the Table, so that it may be seen whether its terms are in order before it is put on the Paper.

MR. PEEL: With your permission, Sir, I will put it in other terms, and ask whether, in view of the fact that a small number of hon. Members ["Oh"], by repeating each other's arguments at continually increasing length ["Order"]——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! Those terms would not be permitted, and the Question does not arise.

Redistribution Bill.

SIR WALTER GREENE: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can now state if there is any likelihood of a Redistribution Bill being brought in next session.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think, perhaps, I have already gone as far as I should go in sketching out the King's Speech for next session, and I should be unwilling to go further. But my hon. friend is well aware that this is a subject which has engaged, and is engaging, the most anxious attention of His Majesty's Government.

MR. FLAVIN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that there will be a considerable redistribution of Tory seats at the next general election?

The Port of London Bill.

MR. JOHN ELLIS: (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, for the convenience of the large interests involved, he will now say definitely when the Port of London Bill will be taken, or whether it may be considered abandoned, and, in that case, when its discharge from the Order-book will be moved.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think the prospects of this Bill are at all favourable. I understand that a great deal of opposition has been aroused on the subject, and it would be quite impossible, in the face of any serious opposition, to carry the Bill in the present state of public business. But I cannot make any further declaration on the subject at present.

*MR. PEEL: May I ask whether, in view of the paramount necessity for setting up some authority to control the Port of London, and in view of the great interests in favour of such a measure, the right hon. Gentleman will undertake, as far as he can, of course subject to other matters, to introduce substantially the same measure early next year.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I confess that I view the position of this Bill with great regret, a Bill which I cannot help thinking is important not only from a Metropolitan, but even from a national point of view. But if, as is the case, the representatives of the Metropolis do not take that view, it is not easy to deal with the Bill. Moreover, the Bill is not an ordinary public Bill, but a hybrid Bill, which requires notices to be given involving great expense and difficulties above the ordinary.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): Will the right hon. Gentleman specify more particularly from what quarter the opposition to this Bill has come, and can the Motion for the discharge of the Bill be put down in such a way as to give the House an opportunity of discussing the reasons why the Bill has been withdrawn?

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): Does the right hon. Gentleman suggest that the opposition to the Bill comes from Metropolitan Members.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes, Sir, I do. I think the request of the hon. Member for Poplar goes beyond ordinary precedent. If hon. Gentlemen desire to discuss Government Bills both when they are introduced and when they are discharged, the difficulties of carrying on public business will be greatly increased.

The Licensing Bill — Clauses 3 and 4.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES asked Mr. Speaker whether the charges and payments imposed by Clauses 3 and 4, as they stood and as they were proposed to be amended by the Government, ought not to be considered first by a Money Committee before the House could take cognisance of them.

*MR. SPEAKER: I have looked into this question, and have come to the conclusion that it is not a case in which a Money Committee is required.

Colonial Office Vote.

MR. JOHN ELLIS: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can now say definitely when the Colonial Office Vote will be taken.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I cannot promise on what Thursday the Colonial Vote will be taken. It may be Thursday week or Thursday fortnight. It will largely depend on the view taken by hon. Gentlemen opposite as to the topics it is most desirable to discuss in Committee of Supply.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): The general feeling on this side of the House is to have this discussion, if possible, as soon as may be after the Papers are in the hands of Members.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I can assure the right hon. Gentleman that any representation of that kind from him must and ought necessarily to carry great weight with the Government.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Has the right hon. Gentleman any statement to make as to business?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I hope my right hon. friend the Secretary for War will be able to make his statement on Thursday. On Friday we propose to take the Second Reading of the Defaulting Authorities Bill.

NEW MEMBER SWORN.

George Charles Bingham, Esquire, commonly called Lord Bingham, for the County of Surrey (North Western or Chertsey Division).

MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY ACT (1882) AMENDMENT BILL [LORDS].

Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday, and to be printed. [Bill 267.]

NEW BILL.

POST OFFICE BILL.

"To amend the Post Office Acts with respect to cumulative commissions on money orders and the use of embossed and impressed stamps," presented by Lord Stanley; to be read a second time upon Thursday, and to be printed. [Bill 268].

LICENSING BILL [2ND ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 2:—

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) moved an Amendment to limit the compensation proposed in the Bill to small houses, under £50 annual value, with the object of moving subsequently, as a consequential Amendment, that "In all other cases the compensation shall be calculated in like manner, except that for the purpose of this calculation the licence shall be assumed to be chargeable with a duty of Excise equal to five times the duty now payable." He explained that his object was to discriminate between the licences of small and large houses. Licensed houses under £50 in annual value were charged with a licence duty of, roughly, 50 per cent. of that annual value. In the case of a house valued at £10 the duty was 60 per cent. At the other end of the scale a house with an annual value of £700 was charged a duty representing 8½ per cent., and a house valued at £2,000 paid less than 3 per cent. If charged at the same rate as the smaller houses, these larger houses would pay £350 and £1,000 respectively in licence duty, and even then they would pay a great deal less than the value of the monopoly which the State had conferred upon them. How did the Home Secretary justify the proposal in the Bill? Did he contend that the licensees had a vested interest in the maintenance of the present scale of licence duties, or did he maintain that a duty of 3 per cent. was sufficiently high? If not, then he should accept the Amendment, which would redress to some extent the injustice of the inequality that now prevailed. For the first time the House, and to some extent the country, had realised that a great monopoly value brought into existence by the State was being handed over to private persons. That had gone on for twenty-five years, but it would not go on for ever. It would be in the power of a new Parliament to say that this monopoly value would be taken by the State by means of an increase in the licence duties. If a future Chancellor of the Exchequer should increase these duties to ten times their present amount then all licences in existence after the passing of such a Budget would have, for the purposes of compensation, one-tenth of the value they possessed before. But the licences that had already been extinguished would have been compensated on the scale provided by the Bill. An anomaly would thus be created which would be held up as a grievance; and this was the time for anticipating such a grievance. He ventured to think that his proposal afforded the most satisfactory method of dealing with it.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 27, at the beginning, to insert the words 'In the case of premises having an annual value, taken as for the purposes of the publican's licence duty, under fifty pounds.'"—(*Mr. Edmund Robertson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL (Sir EDWARD CARSON, Dublin University) declined to follow the hon. Member into his argument upon vested interest. The Committee had already passed the first clause providing that compensation was to be paid. In his opinion the Amendment was impossible. It proposed that a licence-holder should be compensated, not for a loss which he had really sustained having regard to the existing law, but upon the assumption that at some future time the amount of his licence duty would be five times as great as it was now. There was an inequality in the amount paid in licence duties. The Government had attempted in some degree to remedy that inequality by charging a higher proportion upon houses valued at over £50 than upon houses under that amount for the compensation fund. That was the proper and, indeed, the only possible way of dealing with the question.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 133; Noes, 254. (Division List No. 217.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Channing, Francis Allston

Churchill, Winston Spencer
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Charles Ramsay(Galw'y
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Douglas, Charles N. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellice, Capt. EC(S. Andrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans, SirFrancisH.(Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T.(Glamorgan)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmund
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Gladstone, Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E.(Berwick)
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hain, Edward
Harcourt, Lewis V.(Rossendale
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H.(Bristol, E.)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hutchinson, Dr. CharlesFredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent P.(Cavan, W.
Kilbride, Denis
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir JosephF.(Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John (Montrose
Murphy, John
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Kelly, James(Roscommon, N
O'Malley, William
O'Shee, James John
Palmer, George Wm. (Reading)
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Stevenson, Francis S.
Sullivan, Donal
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philip
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wood, James
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Mr. Edmund Robertson and
Mr. Herbert Lewis.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. HnGerald W(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bowles, Lt.-Col. H. F(Middlesex)
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn)
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Campbell, J. H. M.(Dublin Univ.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Rt. Hn. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Crean, Eugene
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley-
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K.D. Wingfield-
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, SirFredDixon
Doogan P. C.
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Finch, Rt. Hn. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. EdwardAlgernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S.(Warwick, S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Maj. Evans-(T'r Hmlets
Gore, Hn. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.)

Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hn. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene,SirE.W.(B'rySt.Edm'ds
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton(Tynem'th)
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Heath,Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords. N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson,Sir A. (Stafford,W.)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse,RtHn,H(Somers't,E
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham
Howard, J. (Midd.,Tottenham)
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kemp, Lieut.-Colonel George
Kennaway,Rt.Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hon.Geo.T.(Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson,John Grant(Yorks.N.R
Lee,Arthur H.(Hants, Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long,Col. Charles W.(Evesham
Long,Rt. Hn.Walter (Bristol,S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Iver,Sir Lewis (Edinbur'h,W
Manners, Lord Cecil
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W.F.
Maxwell,Rt.HnSirH.E.(Wigt'n
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Mitchell, William (Burnley)
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray,Rt.Hn.A.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan,Col.John P.(Galway,N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Dowd, John
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Peel,Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley,S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie,Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robinson, Brooke
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel,Sir Harry S.(Limehouse
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley,Edward Jas.(Somerset)
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thompson,Dr.E C(Monagh'n,N
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.Sir C.E H(Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby,Lt.Col.A.C.E.(Taunton)
Welby,Sir Charles G.E. (Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley,H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh.N.)
Wilson-Todd,Sir W.H.(Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Young, Samuel
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

*SIR WILLIAM HOULDSWORTH (Manchester, N.W.) moved to insert after "where"—the first word of Clause 2—the words "within fourteen years after the passing of this Act," and he explained that if that Amendment were carried he proposed to move—as a consequential Amendment—to insert at the end of the first sub-section of the clause, "And after the fourteen years have expired there shall be paid as compensation to the persons interested in the licensed premises such a sum as shall be equal to the total payments which shall have been made during the said fourteen years in respect of the charges imposed on such premises under Section 3, Sub-section 1, of this Act." This raised the question of a time limit in a sense different from the time limit raised on Clause 1. The Amendments certainly proposed to limit the time during which the full value of the licence was to be paid by way of compensation; but, after the period of fourteen years, compensation was still to go on in a limited form. His object was to limit the whole amount of compensation which would be paid under the Bill, rather than to raise the vexed question of a time limit, although he did raise a time limit incidentally. There was a strong opinion, shared by many inside and outside the House, that the compensation proposed to be given under the Bill was excessive and unjustifiable. It was unjustifiable because he thought that the circumstances of the case as they stood at present had not been considered sufficiently by the Government. What he feared from the practical point of view was that if the present scale of compensation was maintained the reduction of licences in the future would be very much curtailed.

As far as he could judge the position of the fund—although it was difficult to form an opinion on it, and he had hoped the Government would give their calculation as to how many licences would be refused in a given time—as far as he could judge, if the full amount of compensation was to be paid, the reduction of licensed houses for the next twenty years would be very small indeed. He was a supporter of the Bill, and especially of the compensation clauses, because he believed they would have an effect on the licensing justices which would induce and assist them to reduce the number of licensed houses to a greater degree than they had done hitherto. He thought there was a case for compensation in equity, if not in justice, when there was the disturbance which there would be if a large number of licences were withdrawn within a limited period—there was a case in equity owing to the disturbance of the natural expectation which the trade had formed, rightly or wrongly, that there would be a renewal of licences except for misconduct. In these circumstances he thought if the natural expectation were violently and suddenly disturbed, although it had no foundation in law, it was a case for equitable consideration. But these grounds, it appeared to him, did not at all justify the extreme measure for compensation in perpetuity provided by the Bill. There was no case of vested interest—no case of perpetuity of tenure. The discretion of the justices was absolute. That, he understood, was admitted by the Government, and, if so, he held that it ought to be the starting point and the basis on which equitable consideration might be founded in providing compensation for those dispossessed. But the Bill appeared to ignore these considerations altogether. It did not appear to proceed on the considerations he had put before the Committee. If there was an absolute vested interest, if there was undeniable perpetuity of tenure, and if the licensing justices had no discretion at all, he could not conceive that there should be a larger measure of compensation given under the circumstances. As the facts did not coincide with that view it was evident that there might very legitimately be some limitation of the full value compensation which was offered by the Bill in perpetuity. That scale of compensation, he held, was excessive and uncalled for.

Sir William Houldsworth.

His own opinion, and he thought it was also the opinion of a large number, was that ample time notice and pecuniary compensation for licences withdrawn while the time notice was running would fully meet the case. It had been said that a time notice had already been given—that licence-holders had had a time notice for a great number of years. Therefore it might be that the time notice, and compensation during the period of that time notice, might meet the case. But inasmuch as it was hoped and expected that there would be a much larger reduction in the number of licensed houses than had hitherto taken place on the ground simply that they were not required, he thought there was a case for a time limit beyond that which existed at present under the decision in "Sharpe *v.* Wakefield." Thus he was quite prepared to support a further time notice in this Bill with full compensation up to the expiry of the time. He himself thought that was generous treatment. It was all that could be expected and he wondered that the Government had not taken some line of that sort in framing the Bill. It must be remembered also that during the period while the time notice was running, and while redundant licences were being withdrawn, the trade would receive additional compensation in the way of the additional value given to the licences which were left. In the circumstances he thought that fourteen years of full value compensation was ample, but he would not quarrel very much over a longer period. He thought, however, the proposal he made was treating the trade with very great generosity in the circumstances in which they were placed.

Now he came to the main point of his Amendment. He thought there was considerable force in the objection taken in the earlier debates on the time limit question when it was contended that it was not fair for the trade to be compelled by the Bill to contribute to the compensation fund and after a certain period to be excluded from all the benefit of compensation. He thought there was an answer to the objection, but he would not trouble the Committee with it, because he had come to the conclusion that it was an objection that ought to be fairly met. He had endeavoured to do so by the second part of his Amendment which provided for stopping the full value compensation at the end of fourteen years. In addition to that, he thought they ought not to lay hold of the contributions towards the compensation fund which had been given by the trade for houses which after fourteen years might have their licences withdrawn, and, therefore, he thought it was only fair in the case of houses whose licences were withdrawn after the fourteen years period that there should be repayment of the contributions that had been made by them. He did not know whether he had made the point clear. He was trying to meet the objection raised, and also trying to do what he thought was most important, that was, to reduce the amount of compensation to be paid under the Bill, because he was convinced that the amount of compensation provided would not reduce licensed houses to the extent public opinion desired and which almost every man desired to see. There were only two ways of doing it. One was to increase the charges in the schedule. He should be glad to hear whether the Government were prepared to increase these charges. If the compensation to be paid was to remain the same, and if the compensation was to hold out, then the charges in the schedule must be increased. If the Government did not do that, the other way was by reducing the compensation paid. As the Amendment gave full compensation for fourteen years he thought the repayment of the contributions would meet the case. He was inclined to think that if the alternative were put to them, whether they would have the schedule charges increased or a limit to full compensation after fourteen years, the trade would choose the arrangement he proposed.

He would only say in conclusion that this was an attempted compromise between two contending parties. He was afraid that it might share the fate of nearly all compromises of pleasing nobody. At any rate, anxious as he was to see this Bill passed because he believed there was a good deal of temperance reform in it, they must, if possible, try to erect a golden bridge between the two views which were held with regard to the time limit or no time limit. He would appeal to the Government not to ignore the very strong opinion which was held and expressed outside this House on the subject. and in quarters where it could not be said there were extreme temperance advocates. He thought he might call them moderate temperance reformers, although he understood that they were not thought much of in the House. He believed there was a large body of people in the country not identified with the temperance movement at all, who, considering that the proposals in the Bill, if passed, would so revolutionise the position of the trade, and so completely change the tenure of licences for all future years, were not favourable to even getting under these conditions the advantages which they saw under the Bill. If the Government could not see their way to accept the solution he ventured to put before them for their consideration, he hoped that they would, at any rate, endeavour, before the Bill passed, to make some proposal which would meet, to some extent, the very strong opinion which was felt inside and outside the House, and which came from quarters entitled to consideration and respect. He felt convinced that if the Government could see their way to make some conciliatory proposal in this direction, they would not only ensure the passing of the Bill, but, what was quite as important, make it more acceptable to the people of the country. He did not think there was great danger of the Government doing much harm to the trade by accepting the Amendment. He thought he might even appeal to the representatives of the trade in the House, that having made such a good bargain already, they might for their comfort and happiness afterwards very well consider whether they might not, in some way or other, give back a little of what it appeared was going to be given to them. If they did so he thought they would be rewarded afterwards. The Bill would be more heartily accepted by the people of this country if the Government adopted the Amendment, or something in the direction he had indicated, while it would not do a great deal of harm to the trade. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 27, after the word 'Where,' to insert the words 'within fourteen years after the passing of this Act.'"—(*Sir William Houldsworth.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. SEELY (Lincoln) said that on a point of order, might he ask whether this Amendment would rule out of order the Amendment standing in his name on p. 24, dividing up and providing for limiting the compensation?

*THE CHAIRMAN said that the hon. Member had better raise the point at a later stage, and in the meantime he would consider it.

SIR ROBERT REID (Dumfries Burghs) thought this was the most important Amendment put down since the Bill had been presented to the House. It was rightly described by the right hon. Baronet as an honest compromise honestly proposed. He himself went a good deal further than the right hon. Gentleman, but he believed that the Bill would be far better, or rather less bad, if this proposal were accepted. He recognised that it contained a great deal that was valuable, and he should heartily support it if the Committee were obliged to divide upon the question—which he hoped would not be the case. They were discussing the clauses of this Bill under conditions which made it a duty to compress as much as possible all that they had to say on this important subject, but he thought it was most desirable in reference to this measure that there should be some time hereafter at which the nation should be at liberty to resume its right to deal with the extremely difficult question of licensing according to its own best judgment and discretion. Now, it was admitted that the trade was an extremely dangerous trade, however carefully conducted. What the Bill, as it stood, proposed to enact was that existing licences should be enjoyed by the licensees in perpetuity, subject to being bought out at their full value. He agreed with the right hon. Gentleman that the terms of purchase were such that they made any great reduction impossible; but, in addition to that, they were such as to fasten finally and for ever the existing system of the licensing laws on this country. To his mind that was a most important consideration They would fasten definitely and inalienably the present system of licensing laws for all time unless they were to pay an enormous sum in order to cover a change. It was said £125,000,000, but he thought it would be a great deal more.

It seemed to him that they ought to ask themselves this question, "Is it desirable, in the public interest, that the existing system of licensing laws should be perpetuated in such a way that it could not be dealt with by succeeding generations?" The system was based on private enterprise—upon an unrestricted right to make private profit by the use of a State monopoly—concentrated in the hands of a comparatively small number of persons and companies. The disadvantages of the system had been fully admitted on all hands. The Prime Minister himself said that it was regrettable that this system had been allowed to grow up in the form of a monopoly without something having been paid to the State for that monopoly. Without looking at it from a moral point of view, it was unfortunate that a licensing system should have been allowed to grow up which for private profit undoubtedly encouraged excessive drinking; which was socially dangerous; which led to the sale of drink of an injurious character, and to the displacement of non-alcoholic drink; which resulted in unsatisfactory police supervision and to a few cases of corruption in connection with police supervision. There had also grown up an extremely powerful trade organisation which naturally was opposed to any change which might affect their vested interests. There was, he thought, reason to apprehend that these effects would be inflamed instead of being mitigated by the passing of this Bill. But be that so, or be it not, it was at all events fair that they or their children should at some future time be able to alter the whole of the existing licensing system. He would not enter into the various methods by which that could be accomplished. Suffice it to say that it might be thought that this trade was not a proper subject for private profit earning, because it pushed the sale of drink to the detriment of social welfare, and because it was unfair for the State to bestow a monopoly on private persons or companies. This much was perfectly clear that they, or their posterity, probably in progressive times, would desire to alter a system which had been proved to be disastrous in the public interest.

This Amendment provided one method by which the public could, at a date hereafter, reassert its rights on possible terms. Was it just to those who were at present licensed? He was not going to apply a standard of justice which commended itself to his own mind, but would approach it from the point of view of the right hon. Gentleman. He assumed that there was what was called a moral right to compensation on behalf of the trade. But what was the nature and scope of the existing rights of the licensees and also the custom and practice of the magisterial benches in this matter? The position of the licensees at the present moment was that they had a good expectation, not resting on any legal title, but resting upon the general practice of the licensing justices, that if they conducted their houses well their licences would be renewed. Now, he held that they had already had considerable time notice that that was not the case—certainly since the decision in "Sharpe *v.* Wakefield." But there had never been any real doubt, even before that judgment, on the subject at all. Again, it was not the case that the practice to renew licences had been uniform. In the Brewers' Almanac for 1904 there was a statement of the number of licences of which renewals were refused in the nine years preceding 1903. In these nine years 1,337 licences were refused renewal solely on the ground that they were not required in the public interest, and without any compensation. Many others were refused on mixed grounds—that they were not required, that the premises were structurally defective, or that the licensee was neglectful in the conduct of the house. He did not wish to magnify the effect of these figures; but he wanted to point out that it was impossible to say that there had been a uniform and constant custom of renewing licences on good behaviour. There had been a good expectation, and nothing more. There had not been, in practice, certainty of renewal any more than there had been in law a right. That was the real position, fairly stated. Now, if they were going to deal with these licences, if they were going to take them away on a large scale—he doubted if that would be the effect of the Bill—if they were going to bestow compensation on the dispossessed licensees, it was to be remembered that there were other persons to be considered. If they gave more than a fair compensation for a good expectation they would be unjust to the public.

How was that expectation to be appraised? The right hon. Baronet proposed to give in addition to the absolute legal close time fourteen years notice. He agreed that there should be a close time during which it should not be lawful to refuse to renew a licence without compensation. "Close time" was perhaps not a very happy expression; but he meant a period during which a man could not be shot at. Fourteen years would be ample for that purpose. They were asked to look at the question from the point of view of equity to the licence-holder; but they should also regard it from the point of view of equity to the community. The community had bestowed a great gift on the licence-holders, and had refrained from imposing new taxation on them. In America licensees had to pay ten times the amount that was paid in this country; and it was the immunity from taxation that created the monopoly value. Further, there had been four or five Acts during the last thirty years which had immensely enhanced the value of those licences. It was one of the laws of monopoly that the more you restricted it the more valuable it became. Licences had been restricted, they had been reduced in number, and that increased the value of the remaining licences. They, therefore, had a right to regard the question from the point of view of the origin of the licences, and ask fairly whether property of that character should be regarded as if it were freehold property. He thought that if the Amendment were accepted the Bill would be immensely improved and strengthened. Certainly one of his greatest objections to the measure would be removed. Something in the nature of a compromise should be arrived at. If the Bill were passed into law in the face of an extremely strong body of hostile opinion outside the House, by no means confined to members of one particular Party, it could not be regarded as a final settlement. It would be only human nature to endeavour to repeal the Act; and that would produce a condition of chaos which would be extremely unpleasant. The instinct and the inclination of the people of this country were not to unduly disturb legislation which had been passed; but no such feeling could possibly be entertained in connection with this Bill if a compromise were not arrived at. Speaking for himself, a great deal of his hostility to the Bill would be removed if the Amendment were accepted. He did not think it was the best possible Amendment, but it was an honest attempt at a compromise; and for his part he would be gratified if the Government would accept it.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (MR. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.) said he thought that everybody would agree that the two speeches to which the Committee had listened, whether convincing or not, were at all events models of temperate statement. Not only had the Amendment been put before the Committee in a most persuasive manner, but he was perfectly ready to admit that there was a great body of public opinion outside that House, not identified with Party, with extreme temperance views, or with the trade, and quite detached from considerations that perhaps weighed with Party politicians, who would gladly see some change made in the Bill in the direction now suggested. It was with profound reluctance, therefore, that he had to say again that he was really quite unable to follow the logic of the proposals now before them. Of the objects he entirely approved; the methods of advocating those objects had his heartiest sympathy; but when he came to the hard reasons which lay at the root of those suggestions he confessed that he was still unpersuaded. There was a certain inconsistency running through many of the speeches he had heard from the opposite side of the House which was not absent from the speech of the last hon. Gentleman who addressed them. In the earlier part of his speech the hon. and learned Gentleman said they were perpetually riveting round the necks of reformers a system which they would desire to alter at some more or less remote date. But the learned Gentleman went on to say in a different part of his speech what really amounted to the whole thing being reversed next year or three years hence. He quite agreed that such reversals had been unfortunate in the past, and probably would be in the future, but that was a very different proposal from telling them that the House had, by that Bill, entered into an obligation of honour to the licence-holders which made it absolutely impossible for it ever to reverse the decision come to.

SIR ROBERT REID: What I meant was that this Act, so long as it remains an Act, does not create an obligation of honour, but of law. It is quite consistent with that, that any of us who think we are not fairly treated may do our best to get the Act of Parliament repealed.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that was really what he tried to convey to the Committee. It was impossible to talk of a Bill which could be reversed next year or the year after, whenever hon. Gentlemen opposite were in office, as perpetually riveting on the necks of reformers in this country some unreversible order. He did not think the House ought to, or would, repeal this Bill, but it was not under the circumstances an unrepealable law. There were many cases, such as if Parliament were to pass an Act cutting us adrift from all our colonies, where from the nature of the change no repeal would be possible, but this was not one of them. Whether it would be equitable to reverse it depended on the system which was to be substituted for it, and as he did not know what that system was, even in the minds of hon. Gentlemen opposite, he would not argue about it.

Let them consider whether, if they came to the root of the matter, there really was anything which ought to induce them to accept the Amendment. He could show very strong temperance ground why the Amendment should not be adopted, but there was nothing in the Bill to prevent some future generation, when it was agreed upon any scheme, from being able to bring that scheme into operation, and it could do that, of course, as it could deal with licences now, either honestly or dishonestly. They could either do it by treating the equitable claim of the licence-holder equitably, or they could do it by treating the equitable claim of the licence-holder inequitably, and there was nothing, in his judgment, in this Bill which made it more difficult to do this. He really did not wish to go back on old debates, but the root principle of the Bill was compulsory insurance out of the pockets of the trade. Hon. Gentlemen opposite might say it was not paid out of the pockets of the trade, but if they did so they would have to admit that it was impossible for the trade to pay anything towards this object. After all, they could only raise this money by some form of taxation of licences; and, if the taxation of licences did not carry with it the fact that the trade paid that taxation, it was impossible, from the nature of the case, that the trade under any circumstances or by any arrangement could pay it out of their own pockets. He thought he was justified in saying that it was compulsory insurance paid out of the pockets of the trade.

The hon. and learned Gentleman opposite, and he thought his hon. friend, took the view that, if the trade were obliged to pay this compensation for fourteen years, and for fourteen years were prevented from being evicted, except with compensation, they had all the compensation that ought to be allowed to them. His hon. friend went further than that in his Amendment, while the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite suggested that at the end of a period which he called, but miscalled, a close time, the community would be in absolutely free possession of all existing licences, not merely legally, but equitably and righteously, and they might be able to adopt any plan they liked for the future. He traversed that statement altogether. If they chose to give a really close time—say, for the sake of argument, fourteen years—and if they chose to say that no licences were to be withdrawn for fourteen years, of course that would be an immense compensation to the trade. That would be a close time in reality as well as in name, because during that time every licence-holder would be protected from having his licence taken away, he would be able to insure himself so that at the end of fourteen years he would not be injured, and he would not be asked in the meanwhile to pay to the insurance fund of which his hon. friend spoke. But until they made the close time a reality he could not admit that it was in any sense a substitute for the plan they had proposed in the Bill. And supposing they did carry it out, did they think the magistrates or those who had got to administer the Act would feel themselves then in a better position to deal with excessive licences than they felt now? He could not think they would. They would find themselves face to face then, as they did now, with men who under the existing law had been required to spend very large sums of money upon their premises, who had got the expectation of which the hon. and learned Gentleman spoke, and who had been taxed for all these years on their property. They would be face to face with precisely the same class of hardship which, as they knew, in every part of the country hampered the discretion of the ordinary magisterial bench.

In these circumstances it appeared to him that they would be doing away with of the great merits of this Bill without substituting anything really good in its place. If they chose to start a sinking fund out of public money, no doubt they would be able to buy up all the licences in the country He did not advise them to do it, but, if they did, a very small sacrifice on the part of the public would enable them completely, at a given time in the future, to reverse, if it were thought worth while to reverse, the present system of giving licences. But he ventured to say that it really was not wise to mar this scheme because they thought that at some date in the future they would have discovered and be agreed upon some quite different scheme which, when they had discovered and were agreed upon, they would be able quite honestly to impose upon the licence-holder if they compensated him and dishonestly if they refused to compensate him. He wanted a great and immediate reduction of licences, and that great and immediate reduction could only be obtained on the one condition that the local authority was able, where it thought fit, to borrow a large sum of money upon the security of this taxation. But the immediate and great benefits which he, at all events, hoped from this Bill would be altogether diminished if they restricted the number of years in which the capital and sinking fund were to be borrowed and repaid.

SIR WILLIAM HOULDSWORTH said he did not propose to limit the charges. What he was limiting was the amount of compensation paid out of the compensation fund. He expected the capitalisation would go on, and the levy would continue. Therefore he saved the compensation fund.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said it was perfectly true that his hon. friend would save the compensation fund if he compelled the trade to go on insuring their licences long after the insurance had ceased to be effective. If he compelled the trade, after the fourteen years were up, to pay as much for insurance as they paid before, but to get nothing for it, then his hon. friend would save the compensation fund, but surely at the same time he would be committing something very near to a great injustice upon the licence-holder, and he could not believe that, on reflection, that was a proposal he would seriously advocate. The Amendment was not required in the interests of new experiments. Those new experiments could be tried when the country was agreed upon them. He saw no beginning at the present time of any such agreement, and, considering how fierce were the passions which the temperance controversy aroused, he had little hope of seeing men all equally earnestly desirous agreeing upon what they considered a wise and sound plan of temperance reform. If the time should come when such an agreement was arrived at, there was not a comma in this Bill which would put the smallest obstacle in the way of some future Prime Minister, more happily situated than he was, carrying out some great scheme of temperance reform which would conciliate all sides and all opinions, and really bring to an end this long, and, he feared, unending controversy.

*MR. WHITTAKER (Yorkshire, W.R., Spen Valley) assured the Prime Minister that when this subject came to be dealt with in another Parliament it would be the wish of all on that side of the House to deal with it honestly, but what would then be honest depended very largely upon what was done now. If the trade were given rights and position which it did not at present possess, it would be necessary to do much more to be honest than was now necessary. This Bill was more than just to the trade; an excessive amount of compensation was being given for an excessive period, and what was more than justice to the trade was less than justice to the public. The analogy which had been urged with regard to assurance was somewhat false. There were such things as temporary assurances. Fire and accident assurances were effected for a period of years, but if no fire or accident occurred there was no return other than the security enjoyed during the period. People did not expect to get their money back at the end of the time. There were also temporary assurances against death. It was true the ordinary form of assurance was against death whenever it occurred, but the premium then was much higher. Under the present proposal the premium was low, the assurance was a temporary one to cover the risk of loss of licence during a given period, and there was no validity whatever in the contention that the sums paid should be repaid at the end of the period. What was required was equitable consideration. Temperance reformers desired, and it was in their interest, to treat the trade fairly. The more extreme they were and the more licences they desired to see abolished, the more it was in their interest to treat the trade fairly and equitably, because they could not get rid of licences without persuading the public of the necessity, and it would be much more difficult to do that if there was any sense of hardship or unfairness connected with it. Their complaint against the Bill was that it went beyond all that was equitable and reasonable, that it gave excessive compensation for an excessive period, and was therefore unjust to the public.

With regard to the provision of compensation the business-like way of proceeding would be to take out a temporary assurance against the loss of the licence —and that was what the Bill provided. But at the end of the period the public should be at liberty to deal with the licences as they wished, and that practically meant that the value of the licences should cease at the end of the period. The proper means of meeting that contingency was for the owner and occupier to set up a sinking fund to cover the possible loss. The extra profit which the reduction in licences would bring to the remaining houses would be ample to provide a sufficient sinking fund for that purpose. The Prime Minister had suggested that fourteen years was too short a period. Personally he had never been disposed to insist upon a hard-and-fast line as to time; so long as full freedom was given to the justices and the public to carry out any reform they desired, he was not particular as to the number of years. If ample time were given, a sinking fund could very easily be set up, and the licence-holder would suffer no loss whatever. The contention that if the period were limited to fourteen years the sum raised would be too small to secure anything like an adequate reduction implied that the Prime Minister contemplated the borrowing of money for more than fourteen years, because unless money was borrowed on the security of the levy for more than fourteen years, there would be precisely the same reduction during the fourteen years as if there were no limit. It was a serious thing if the Government intended to allow borrowing for anything like that period. It would mean that during the time that all the levy was allocated in advance, practically all control over the liquor trade would be lost. The one thing that gave the authorities any control over the trade was the power to refuse the renewal of licences; that power was being limited by the necessity of paying compensation, but if the compensation fund were allocated for fourteen years it would disappear altogether. Personally, he objected altogether to the idea of borrowing. It was perfectly true that in one year sufficient money could not be raised to secure an adequate reduction of licences, but there was no reason why the levy should not be spread over a considerable number of years without borrowing. As a matter of fact, there ought not to be any limit to the levy, and personally he would be prepared to assent to the fund being increased by special levies on beer and spirits. The mover of the Amendment put the case very forcibly when he said that at present there was no vested interest or perpetual tenure, and the magistrates had full power. Under this Bill the position of the licence-holder would be altogether altered to the disadvantage of the public.

In regard to a time limit of some sort, he thought the old Church leases were on all fours with these licences, and that the precedent set in their case was an extremely valuable one. For 100 or 200 years it had been the custom for the Church to grant its leases illegally. The statutes forbade leases except for twenty-one years in possession, and forty years for mining and building, but the Church was in the habit of granting renewals on the payment of fines. Many Committees of both Houses of Parliament sat and endeavoured to provide means of getting rid of the difficulty, because the leases became enormously valuable properties. A Committee of the House of Lords in 1851 reported that for 200 years these leases had been illegally granted. They were made the subject not only of mortgage but of settlement and devise with limitations to children and their posterity. Legacy duty had been paid for years to the Government on the expectancy of renewal, and the Court of Chancery, in settling marriage settlements, had made these twenty-one year leases the subject of settlement and devise, with limitations extending to grand-children and great-grand-children. That showed how these leases had been regarded and dealt with by the law. There was a case in Paddington where it was decided to allow the land to be built upon, and Parliament allotted two-thirds of the value to the tenant and one-third to the Church, thus recognising the enormous interest the leaseholder had in that property. In 1860 Parliament dealt with these leases and handed them over to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and provided that no lease should be renewed after 1884, and those which expired before 1884 should only be extended to that year, and that was practically imposing a time limit. These leases were granted in violation of the law and became valuable property, and this House dealt with them in the same way as it was now suggested that these licences should be dealt with, because they brought in the element of a time limit as the basis of an equitable settlement.

The Amendments put down within the last few days to Clause 4 suggested the desirability of accepting some such Amendment as this. The basis of the new licences was to be a time limit not exceeding seven years, which was deemed sufficient to recoup the licence-holder for his investment. The present Amendment suggested fourteen years for the old licences. If seven years was enough for the new licences, surely fourteen years would be ample for the old ones. When the right hon. Gentleman dealt with a similar proposal to this upon a former occasion he made much of the insecurity of the tenure, and he said if they had anything like a time limit the holder of the licence would become very careless, and all sorts of evil would result. At that time he (the hon. Member) ventured to point out to the Prime Minister that security of tenure had proved to be the source of a great deal of mismanagement in the worst class of houses. As it was now proposed that the new licences should terminate at the end of seven years, it would have been very curious if the Prime Minister had repeated his old argument. Therefore they might dismiss that argument as having no bearing on the case now. It was important to remember that the proposal for the new licences meant that a large additional value would be given to the existing licences. This new proposal practically meant that no new licence was ever to be issued again upon the same conditions as the present ones. That placed existing licences in an exceptional position, and gave them an increased market value. Now they were being deprived of the power to deal freely with them. That proposal would give the present licences an extraordinary market value; and this point ought to be taken into consideration in connection with the time limit which had been suggested. Surely this Bill ought to provide some opportunity at some time or other of getting the whole of the licences upon the new revised system. There ought to be some period fixed when the revised licensing system would come into force, and that was a strong argument against establishing a system of perpetuity in licences.

Sir JOHN GORST (Cambridge University) said he wished to say a few words in support of his hon. friend's Amendment. What they were discussing was really the amount of compensation which ought to be paid. The hon. Member for Manchester said the amount fixed by the Bill was too great and it was quite evident that that was the opinion of the general public, because since this Bill had been introduced, as he had stated upon a former occasion, there had been an extraordinary rise in the value of shares in all the great brewery companies on the Stock Exchange. The hon. Baronet the Member for Peckham had stated that this rise was only an example of the general rise of securities which had taken place in recent times. That was not so because he had received letters from directors and shareholders in great brewery companies saying that it was a fact that the introduction of this Bill had increased the value of their shares by giving a security of tenure where there had been no security of tenure before. When an insecure tenure was turned into a secure one it did raise the value of the property and to that extent in this case it did an injustice to the public. He agreed that the Amendment which the Government had proposed to Clause 4 entirely altered this question of a time limit, and it was exactly what he himself had put down on the Paper as an Amendment with regard to new licences. New licences were to have a seven years run, and at the end of that time the licensing authority was to have the most perfect freedom to make the best they could of the licence and renew it to someone else at an increased rental. All that was proposed in this case was to purchase from the existing licence-holders the right to place them on the same footing as all new licence-holders. If they did not accept some kind of time limit they would have two classes of licences. The old licences would become extremely valuable under this Bill. They had heard a great deal about the pre-1869 beerhouses, but they were now setting up pre-1904 beerhouses. The Prime Minister said that this Bill was no obstacle to future licensing reform. Everyone knew what an obstacle the pre-1869 beerhouses had been, and it was not at all certain that the pre-1904 beerhouses would not prove just as great an obstacle to temperance reform as the pre-1869 beerhouses had done.

The principle of this Amendment was a very simple one and he could not understand the inability of the First Lord of the Treasury to accept it. He recognised that in past times a very valuable monopoly which really was the property of the public was, under the law, given to the licence-holders. It ought to have been sold to them as it was going to be in the future. The law did not allow that and the justices who granted a licence had no alternative but to make a very valuable present of public property to somebody or other. It was recognised as a sort of expectation which had grown up and which they ought not to absolutely confiscate but which ought to be purchased from the holder at a reasonable value. The whole question was, what was the proper compensation to pay the existing licence-holders for giving up the monopoly which they now enjoyed? He did not pretend to say whether it ought to be enjoyment for a period of fourteen or twenty-one years, but clearly it ought to be for some definite term of years. The licence-holder at present had no legal right to a renewal of his licence. It was only an expectation but they were now giving him a right to renewal unless he was compensated for the full value of the licence taken from him. The proposal of the hon. Baronet the Member for North-west Manchester was that during a period of fourteen years no licence should be taken away unless compensation was given to the holder. It was said that this was a compulsory insurance by the publicans out of their own funds. He thought that a great deal too much had been made of that point by the supporters of this Bill. There was no reason whatever why a fund for public purposes should not be raised by increasing the licensing tax, and if the State chose to increase the licensing tax for the purposes of compensation, it was really giving the publicans compensation out of public funds. [MINISTERIAL cries of "No."] It was giving the publicans compensation out of funds which might be raised by Parliament and devoted to public purposes. Nothing in the world was easier than the making of a calculation of the amount required to give compensation for fourteen years and no longer. The actuary of any insurance company would at once calculate the amount that would have to be paid for fourteen years and no longer. The Solicitor-General had asked what they were going to do at the end of fourteen years. The answer was that at the end of fourteen years the licence-holder would have no further right to a renewal of the licence. The question was, is it a fair and reasonable bargain to the holders of existing licences to give them fourteen years secure tenure in exchange for the precarious tenure which they now have? His opinion was that it was fair, and he thought the general opinion certainly was that the perpetual tenure given them by the Government in this Bill was too much, as the rise in brewery shares incontestably showed.

There was one point of the Bill which had never been properly explained, and that was the words in the clause which provided that the compensation was to be "calculated as if this Act had not passed." This expression might have a sinister meaning for the licence-holders. It might mean that the compensation was to be calculated as if the tenure was the present precarious annual tenure and not the perpetual right to their licences which the publicans thought they were getting and which evidently the investors on the Stock Exchange thought they were getting. Was there any trap in these words, "calculated as if this Act had not passed," to catch the holders of existing licences? It might turn out that the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for North-west Manchester was really more advantageous to the holders of licences than the terms of the Bill. The publicans ought to be careful that they were getting the boon they expected. He could quite understand that for the next year or two it would be very easy for an experienced valuer to say in a case of compensation that if the Act of 1904 had not been passed the holder of this licence would have had a precarious annual tenure, that he would have been liable to lose his licence at the discretion of brewster sessions, and that, therefore, he would not value it at more than five or six years purchase. That was very much less than the fourteen years proposed by the Amendment, and which the Member for North-w st Manchester, was willing to concede to the existing licence-holders. But his difficulty about the words was in regard to what would happen twenty or thirty years hence, and what a valuer would then do if called upon to estimate the value of a licensed house "as if this Act had not passed." How would the valuer set about his work? He should like the Solicitor-General, or the hon. Member for the Stretford Division, who had experience in these valuation questions, or in the absence of these learned Gentlemen, the Home Secretary, to say definitely, first of all, how the value of a licence was to be estimated immediately after the Act was passed, and how the value was to be estimated twenty or thirty years afterwards. It would be a very great mistake if the trade allowed themselves to be contented with provisions which would not give them the protection they expected, and which would expose them to the risk of this particular Act being tampered with and altered by legislation in a future Parliament by people who might think that this Bill had not received due deliberation when passing through the House.

Sir **EDWARD GREY** (Northumberland, Berwick) said that as the Home Secretary had not risen to answer the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University as to the meaning of the words "calculated as if this Act had not passed," he should like to press the point, because it was a matter of the greatest importance. Both the right hon. Gentleman the Member for North-west Manchester and the Prime Minister spoke as supporters of the Bill, but it was plain from their speeches that in opinion they were worlds apart. The mover of the Amendment had complained that the Bill ignored the three main facts. It ignored that there was now no vested interest, and no perpetuity of tenure, and it ignored the fact that the discretion of the justices was absolute in the matter of refusing to renew licences. He did not profess to be able to reconcile the speech of the Prime Minister and that of the right hon. Member for North-west Manchester. But the ignoring of these facts in the Prime Minister's speech and in the Bill itself was a very considerable part of the case against the Bill. The Bill, moreover, was going to abolish the notice or warning to the trade, which the mover of the Amendment said existed already. The right hon. the Member for North-west Manchester said that moderate temperance reformers were not treated too well in the House. He admitted that he spoke rather slightingly the other day, not of the right hon. Gentleman, but of the class to which he belonged as being people who expressed their opinions but would not enforce them. While the speech of the right hon. Member for north-west Manchester was sound and satisfactory, he could not refrain from asking what was going to happen if the Amendment was rejected. The true type of a moderate man was the right hon. and learned Member for Dumfries who had made, as the Prime Minister himself admitted, a most moderate speech, in which the right hon. and learned Gentleman said that if this Amendment were carried, it would considerably modify his opinion in regard to the Bill. But if it was rejected by the Government, he remained an inveterate opponent of the Bill. Was the opinion of a moderate temperance reformer to be enforced? Would the right hon. Gentleman become an inveterate opponent of the Bill if the Amendment was rejected? That was the only way in which to enforce the opinion of moderate temperance reformers; but if the Amendment was not accepted then all the expressions of opinion about temperance reform by the right hon. Gentleman were absolutely useless. They would count for nothing unless the right hon. Gentleman changed his action from support of the Bill into hostility.

He maintained that the Bill placed private before public interest in this matter. Temperance reformers wanted freedom to reduce licences, to change to a better system in carrying on the liquor trade, and to increase the licence duties. When was that time going to come? The answer of the Government as embodied in the Bill was "Never," and this was the reason of the right hon. Gentleman's Amendment. The Prime Minister said that future projects of temperance reform would not be prejudiced. The Bill, however, was being construed by the trade as giving them a title. If no Amendment of this kind was accepted, then, though he admitted that at present there was a claim for equitable consideration on behalf of the trade, he said that the Bill was going to transform the claim, not in equity, but in law. By doing this it was going to weaken very much the claim in equity; and if the Amendment was rejected, whatever the Bill might do in law, it was not attaching equity to what it did. Though it might be giving something in law, it was not only giving nothing, but removing something of the equitable consideration which many opponents of the measure felt to be due. That was why he joined in the appeal of the right hon. Gentleman who put this Amendment forward as an honest compromise. But the right hon. Gentleman also uttered a note of warning. He asked the trade to remember how good a bargain they were making at the present time—he supposed with the present Government—and to consider whether by being reasonable in accepting some Amendment of this kind they would not make themselves more comfortable in the hereafter. Even if the Amendment were accepted, he did not say that it would be regarded as absolutely satisfactory by all sections of temperance reformers, but it would do a good deal to weaken the resentment with which the Bill was being received. The Amendment, indeed, touched the very essence of the controversy, for it dealt with the question whether it was possible to turn the Bill into something which might be a measure of temperance reform, or whether it would not be a permanent barrier to temperance reform.

Mr CRIPPS (Lancashire, Stretford) said that the hon. Baronet opposite and others had argued as if the Bill provided something in the nature of excessive compensation to the trade or the owners of public-houses. But if they were to have anything in the nature of compensation at all, he contended that they could not have it in a more moderate or restricted form than in the Bill—if the measure was really understood. It had been argued that when licensed premises were taken for the purpose of public improvements two kinds of compensation were in force. There was a trading compensation and a compensation for a diminution in the value of the premises themselves. As a rule the trade compensation was the larger figure of the two; but in the Bill there was no trade compensation of any kind. They were looking at the difference in the value of the premises as licensed or unlicensed, and this did not bring into consideration what was known as trade compensation at all. He also contended that most absurd estimates had been published as to the price which would be paid by way of compensation under the Bill. All these estimates had been based on a misapprehension because those who had formulated them had not studied what the proposals of the Government were in the Bill. If compensation meant indemnity, as it did, it was only fair to take into consideration all the special conditions in each case, and nothing could be more unfair than to bring in a number of years which in some cases would be too many and in others too few.

They had to consider what was the chance of the renewal of a licence, if this Bill had not been passed. There were certain public-houses where the number of years purchase would be exceedingly small, because, having regard to the conditions, there was a great chance of the licences not being renewed. On the other hand, in the case of well-conducted public-houses, which were not likely to be interfered with, a much larger number of years purchase would be given; because if compensation meant indemnity all the special conditions in each particular case should be taken into consideration. In such circumstances, could anything be more unfair than to bring in a number of years which in some cases would give too much compensation, and in other cases would penalise properly conducted licensed houses. A larger measure of compensation would be given to the worst public-houses, and a smaller measure to the best conducted houses. Could any system of compensation which professed to be fair and equitable be worse than that? It could not be contended that the Bill would give a freehold or a permanent tenure. He would oppose that to the utmost, because it would give the licence-holder something to which he was not entitled. He would not give the licence-holder any greater interest than he had at present; and he could not imagine any member of the legal profession reading the Bill in any other sense.

If land were taken by a railway company it was valued for the purposes of compensation as it was, not as it would be when utilised by the railway company. Under this Bill, it was also expressly provided that the compensation should be assessed as if the Act had not been passed, and as if no increased security had been given. He thought it was of extreme importance that the question of compensation should be really understood and appreciated. There was no practical difficulty in the matter. After all, it was a case of insurance; and he could not understand the argument that it would be impossible in the future to put additional taxation on the property because of the insurance. The compensation was not in any sense a public tax; and, although he would demur to it at present, still if, in the future, additional taxation were thought to be fair, having regard to similar burdens on other classes, the present Bill would not prevent it. The word monopoly had been used. A railway company very often obtained from Parliament a very valuable monopoly. If, afterwards, it was found that the monopoly turned out to be more profitable than had been expected, was that any reason why the State should tax off the whole of the surplus profit. A principle of that kind would destroy all interest in statutory property. Having given a statutory expectation, the State could not annex the profits if the expectation turned out to be profitable. The Bill would not give the trade any greater right than it at present possessed; but, having regard to established expectation, they were entitled to have a fair measure of compensation assuming they conducted their business in a proper manner. He was not prepared to introduce a time limit, which, during its duration, would make any alteration of the law impossible. The Act might work well or badly. He believed it would work well; but if it worked badly it would be impossible during the period of the time limit to alter the law, however badly the Act might be operating. In that respect, he joined issue with the right hon. Baronet.

Sir EDWARD GREY said his argument was that Parliament always had the right.

Mr. CRIPPS said it would not have the right during the period of the time limit. That was why he objected to the Amendment. He did not want Parliament to be fettered in the event of the Act not working properly. He believed that the compensation to be provided would be sufficient without a time limit to reduce the number of public-houses by a third; and thereby effect a most desirable temperance reform.

Mr. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) said the subjects which were dealt with by the hon. and learned Member for Stretford were intricate subjects and dealt with in an intricate way but they seemed to him to be rather remote from the Amendment of the hon. Member for Manchester. The First Lord of the Treasury could only defend this Bill by assuming facts that did not exist and ignoring facts that did.

The right hon. Gentleman commenced by assuming that the licence-holder had a perpetuity of tenure and therefore had a *bona fide* right to compensation and he was obliged to ignore what appeared to him to be a far more material part of the case, namely, that the licence-holder, or the brewer behind him, by this Bill would not only receive compensation but be put into a better position than before by reason of the fact that there would be less competition. It was under these circumstances that they failed to find any argument in the statements of the First Lord of the Treasury against the Amendment of the hon. Member for Manchester. He did, however, welcome one deliverance of the right hon. Gentleman which was also apparent in the speech of the hon. and learned Member for Stretford. Both were much impressed with the objects of temperance reform. They denied that any difficulty would be placed in the way of temperance reform because the power of Parliament to further temperance reform would remain the same as though this Bill had not passed. The hon. Member for Stretford could not possibly understand how matters could be made worse by this Bill because the powers of Parliament remained and the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord refused to admit any argument adduced against this Bill in respect of the difficulty it put in the way of temperance reform. If a compromise like this was refused it was quite clear they were thrown back to a position in which this Bill had no moral force at all. That was the position forced upon them. They objected to the Bill, and felt that they could not do better than to give due notice that they noted what was said by the right hon. Gentleman that he did not think it would make any difference in the future. It would be, then, all the easier to induce some future Parliament to bring about those reforms which they thought were necessary before but which would be doubly necessary now.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.) said the ingenious speech of the hon. Member for Stretford had shown very clearly that it was most desirable that this clause should be throughly discussed before it passed into law and that some explanation should be given by the Government as to the exact way in which it was to work. The learned Solicitor-General might be able to explain to the Committee the exact principle upon which the Inland Revenue would value, and how they were likely to value, licensed houses under this Bill. He feared the debate would have little practical result, but as he had a kindred Amendment upon the Paper he felt constrained to add a few words. His Amendment contained what was properly called a time limit, and he had always thought that justice rather than generosity should guide the amount of compensation and that it should be for a limited period and on a sliding scale. What was in his mind was that there should be a period when the public would be free to introduce a better licensing law. It was generally admitted that licence-holders now had only an equitable claim, but this Bill, if passed into law in its present shape, would give them a vested interest of a perpetual character and future Parliaments when they desired to interfere with those vested interests would always have this Bill held up to them in the future as giving a legal and moral claim to the licence-holder, a claim which he did not now possess. He therefore contended that, if this Amendment was not accepted, an impediment would be thrown in the way of preserving to the public the right of licensing public-houses. All that was required was to see that justice was done. There was no reason for being generous to the trade. The Government were tying the hands of the public authorities in the future. The result, no doubt, might be the closing of considerable numbers of useless and pernicious public-houses now, but they must not entirely sacrifice the future to the present, and they might well be content with a smaller sum of money than was contemplated by the right hon. Gentleman rather than adopt a policy which, though it might have striking results at present, would put the licensing authorities in great difficulty, tie their hands at no very distant date, and be a bar to all further progress. They might fairly look forward to the time when more would be demanded in the way of temperance reform than was now demanded and therefore they ought to see that this compensation fund should be an assistance and not a hindrance. At present he was not satisfied that the Inland Revenue would be able to arrive at what was the moral and equitable value of a licensed house before the passing of this Bill, and he therefore appealed to the Solicitor-General to throw some light on this matter, and make it clear, in order that the Committee might know how far it was going.

*Mr. TOMKINSON (Cheshire, Crewe) Expressed the opinion that this Amendment went to the heart of the whole question. It had been pointed out by the hon. Member who moved the Amendment, and still more forcibly by the hon. Member for Blackpool on the Second Reading of the Bill, that by providing a compensation fund they would at any rate liberate the hands of the licensing justices and free them from the natural reluctance they now felt to take away a licence without compensating the holder. He might be allowed to remind the Committee of some figures where the action of the magistrates in reducing licences to the great benefit of the community had taken place. This had taken place in districts where the evil had been forced upon the attention of the magistrates. In Liverpool 350 licences had been taken away in thirteen years, with the result that the arrests for drunkenness had decreased from 16,000 to 4,000. They had been able to dispense with the services of 100 policemen, and the moral condition of that town had been wonderfully improved in spite of the large and growing population. In Blackburn the number of licences had been reduced in fifteen years from 600 to 417, while the proceedings against licensees had diminished from thirty-nine to seven, and the arrests for drunkenness and disorder from 989 to 624 per annum.

*The CHAIRMAN: The hon. Gentleman is now dealing with the general question. I must ask him to confine his remarks to the Amendment before the Committee.

*Mr. TOMKINSON said he was endeavouring to show that some time limit ought to be imposed, and that the compensation fund would be altogether inadequate to effect even such a reduction as had been made under existing circumstances. In Winchester there was one licence to every 150 people. The licensing magistrates gave the brewers one year in which to submit a plan for reduction. They agreed to surrender fifty licences without any compensation, but after the speech of the Prime Minister they withdrew the offer, and now every one of those licences would have to be paid for on the basis of this Bill. He submitted that, unless a time limit were imposed, the efforts of temperance reformers for more than fifty years would be frustrated, and the trammels of the drink traffic more firmly fixed upon the backs of the people.

Sir EDWARD CARSON said that if, as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Somersetshire had stated, it was essential that this clause should be fully discussed in order that the Committee might know where they stood, with regard to the principle of compensation, it was a pity the whole afternoon should have been spent in discussing a question which had already been debated for two days and voted upon by the Committee. With regard to the words "calculated as if this Act had not passed," the right hon. Gentleman had asked how anybody would be able to calculate, some years hence, the value of a business at the time this Bill passed, taking into consideration the conduct and everything else connected with the person carrying it on. The words had no application at all to the valuation in that sense. It was contended that the Bill would give a permanent or, at all events a statutory term to the licensee. The words meant that in the valuation no such permanency should be taken into account, but that, when the Commissioners came to fix the value of a licence or the value of premises for the purposes of the clause, they should consider the value having regard to the fact that the renewal of the licence was subject to the absolute discretion of the magistrates, and that the holder of the licence had only just such a tenure as he at present possessed. If there was any doubt as to the exact meaning of the words, he was prepared to insert "as if the licence were subject to the same conditions of renewal as were applicable immediately before the passing of this Act," or he would consider any other form of words that might be submitted before the Report stage. He hoped the Committee would now come to a decision on the question as there were a number of other Amendments which he would be glad to hear discussed.

AN HON. MEMBER: Then why do you not extend the time?

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield) said the meaning of the clause had not yet been made perfectly clear. If no agreement were come to and the matter went to arbitration, the question would be left to the Commissioners of Inland Revenue, who based their valuations on the takings of the houses.

SIR EDWARD CARSON: That is not so.

MR. MARKHAM said he was basing his remarks on the statement of the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Dumfries, and he would be glad to know upon what other basis than that of the takings of the house the Commissioners could arrive at a value. He should not support the Amendment, because he failed to see how anybody could vote for it who was opposed altogether to the principle of compensation.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 209; Noes, 250. (Division List No. 218.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork,N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Baird, John George Alexander
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C.B.
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Bousfield, William Robert
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M.(Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell Rt. Hn.J.A.(Glasgow
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay(Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M.(Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellice,CaptEC(S.Andrsw's Bgh
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans,SirFrancisH.(Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hn. SirE. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hain, Edward
Harcourt, LewisV.(Rossendale
Harcourt, RtHnSirW(Monm'th
Harwood, George
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Heath,Arthur Howard(Hanley
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C.E.H. (Bristol,E.)
Hobhouse Rt Hn H. (Somers't,
Holland, Sir William Henry
Howard, J. (Midd.,Tottenham)
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fred
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennaway,Rt.Hn.Sir John H.
Kennedy, Vincent P.(Cavan,W
Kilbride, Denis
Lambton Hon. Frederick Wm.
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex.(Donegal,W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,SirJoseph F.(Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Maxwell W.J.H.(Dumfriesshire
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt.Hn.John (Montrose

Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F.X.(Cork)
O'Brien, Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary,N.
O'Connor James(Wicklow,W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, James(Roscommon,N
O'Shee, James John
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pemberton, John S. G.
Perks, Robert William
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Reid, Sir R.Threshie(Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shaw-Stewart,Sir H (Renfrew)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Smith,H C(North'mb.Tyneside.
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spear, John Ward
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Stewart, Sir MarkJ.M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Afred(Merthyr)
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan,
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York,W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Wilson, Chas.Henry(Hull,W.)
Wilson, HenryJ. (York,W.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Woodhouse,SirJ.T.(Huddersfld
Yoxall, James Henry.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir William Houldsworth and Mr. Tritton.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt Hon Sir H.
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. JoscelineFitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour,Rt. Hon A. J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour,RtHn GeraldW(Leeds)
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir FrederickGeorge
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Bond, Edward
Bowles,Lt.-ColH.F. (Middlesex
Bowles, T. Gibson (King'sLynn
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, J.H.M.(DublinUniv.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish,V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, RtHonJ(Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt HnJA(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Crean, Eugene
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt.Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland,Sir FredDixon
Dorington, Rt Hon. SirJohnE.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke Rt.Hon. SirWilliamHart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson,Rt.Hn.SirJ.(Manchr
Finch, Rt. Hn. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald,Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hon. EdwardAlgernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S(Warwick,S.W.
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, HnJ.E. (Elgin&Nairn)
Gordon, MajEvans-(T'rH'mlets
Gore, Hon S.F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, SirEW(B'rySEdm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hardy, Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton(Tynem'th)
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Heath, James (Staffords.N.W.
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, SirA.(Stafford, W.)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard John(KentFaversham
Hozier, Hon James HenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W(Salop
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour

Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, JohnGrant(Yorks.NR
Lee, ArthurH(Hants.Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col.Charles W.(Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter(BristolS
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis(Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J.)Porstmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Iver, Sir Lewis(EdinburghW
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W.F.
Maxwell, RtHn SirHE(Wigt'n
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H.M.
Mitchell, William (Burnley)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan,DavidJ.(Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, RtHnAGraham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan, Col.John P.(Galway,N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, HerbertPike(Darlington
Peel, HnWm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon M W (Stalybridge
Ritchie,Rt.Hon. ChasThomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W.(Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, SirHarryS(Limehouse
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Sir E. (W.Bromwich)
Stanley, HonArthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, EdwardJas(Somerset)
Stanley, Rt Hon Lord (Lancs.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chicester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv
Thompson, DrEC (Monagh'n,N
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.SirC.E.H (Sheffield
Walker, Col. William Hall
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-ColACE (Taunton)
Welby, Sir CharlesGE(Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. JohnLloyd
Whiteley, H(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A.Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson-Todd, SirWH (Yorks.)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. H'n. C.B.Stuart
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Young, Samuel
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

*MR. BLACK (Banffshire) said the Amendment which stood in his name on the Paper would, he hoped, not be considered as marring the Bill, because it was in entire accordance with its principle, and provided that where a licence was forfeited for public purposes the compensation should be paid by the trade. Unless this Amendment was inserted in the Bill, the net result would be that public improvements would be greatly hindered, because undoubtedly the result of the measure would be to very largely increase the amount of compensation which, but for the Amendment, would be required to be paid by the public authority if the licence were forfeited for any purpose of public improvement or utility. In several respects the monopoly value of the licence would be enhanced by the passing of this measure. First of all there would be an increased value vested in the licence by legitimate increase, in consequence of the payment of contributions and diminution in other licences under this Act. First of all there would be fixity of tenure proposed by this measure which was estimated to increase the value by three or four times. Then there was the increase in value which accrued by increased population, and non-granting of new licences, but there would also be increases in monopoly value which might be termed illegitimate. There would also be the increment through forfeiture of other licences by non-observance of the terms of the licence granted. Further there would be the withdrawal of reasonable pressure brought to bear on licence-holders by the licensing authorities. For instance, he was informed that out of forty-six licences withdrawn in Glasgow by the operation of the public authority, only four received any compensation, because the magistrates were enabled by the reasonable pressure they brought to bear on the licence-holders to dispense with the licences without compensation. If a public authority in any future time required to suppress licences, they would require, according to the proposals of the Bill, to pay the increased monopoly value of those licences. He further submitted the Amendment was reasonable because in making a public grant of a monopoly to a trade—as they did in this case—it was reasonable that they should do so subject to the public uses. The obligation to pay compensation on the part of the trade was stronger in this case than where a licence was taken away on the ground of non-requirement, because in the case he was figuring the licence which had been removed would be a valuable licence, and not one which was not required. The result would consequently be that the trade — unless the Amendment were accepted—would get the full increment in the shape of largely increased trade without any payment on its part. The Government were between two masters, one being the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham—who really made the suggestion to which his Amendment gave effect —and the other the brewing interest. It would be interesting to see which master the Government would serve.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 28, after the word 'Act,' to insert the words 'or where licensed premises are required for purposes of public utility or improvement.'"—(*Mr. Black.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's) said the clause only applied to licences taken away for a particular purpose. What the hon. Member proposed was that if it was necessary to take a licence away for the purposes of a public improvement, it should come under the provisions of this Bill. Surely that was entirely reversing the practice which now prevailed, which was that if property was taken away for the purposes of public improvements compensation should be given under the Lands Clauses Act. He could not see why if a house was taken away, and the licence forfeited for the purposes of a public improvement, compensation should come out of the fund provided for by this Bill.

*MR. BLACK said that in deference to the opinion expressed by his hon. friends around him he did not propose to divide the House. He asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. SEELY moved an Amendment defining the amount of compensation to be paid to different persons who were interested in a licensed house. Under the proposals of the Government that was left to be decided by quarter sessions. It would be felt by many persons, and very largely by those who were interested in these houses, that it would be an advantage if the House were to define the amounts that were to be paid to the different persons concerned, both because the question was one of very great importance, and also because the compensation under the Bill was for an act of a public kind different in character from the usual acts for which compensation was paid. If an ordinary property was taken for a railway or a public improvement the persons dispossessed, although debarred from carrying on their business at a particular place, were not prevented from commencing again in a neighbouring place. But under the Bill if a public-house was closed there would be no opportunity for a man, once dispossessed of his licence, carrying on business in a neighbouring street because the very intention of the Act was to diminish the number of licences. Therefore the publican was subjected to a kind of inconvenience and loss which the ordinary person whose business was taken away in consequence of a public improvement was not generally subjected to. It was consequently necessary to carefully define the particular amounts which were to be paid and the manner in which it was proposed to distribute them.

First of all, he proposed that those who were employed in or about licensed premises should be paid three months wages or salary. This was to meet the case of tenants, managers, and other persons employed in these houses who, if there was a general reduction of licences as the Prime Minister suggested, would be seriously injured in consequence of the difficulty of obtaining employment in their own business. Then he proposed that the occupier of the premises, *i.e.*, the tenant, should have a sum equal to two years profits, calculated on the average of the last five years and also the difference between the value of the stock and fittings in the premises as valued between the ingoing and outgoing tenant. He also proposed to give to the licence-holder a definite right, which he did not feel at all certain he would have under the Bill, of compensation for the loss of his stock. There were many licence-holders the greater part of whose capital was invested in the stock and fittings of their respective houses, and if their licences were taken away, they would be injured by being obliged to sell, and further by the fact that a reduction in the number of houses would lead to a corresponding reduction in the demand for stock. He did not see anything in the Bill to enable quarter sessions to make an allowance of that kind to the occupier, and it was therefore well to insert a definite proposal in the Bill. Then he proposed that the owner of the premises should have the cost of any structural alteration necessary to adapt the premises to other uses than the sale of intoxicating liquors; and further, that up to 1914 there should be paid in addition to the compensation mentioned to the owner of the premises a sum equal to the average annual profits as above, multiplied by the number of years unexpired between the date of the refusal of the licence and 31st December, 1914.

The Prime Minister had stated that he could not understand the argument in favour of the time limit; but the right hon. Gentleman must acknowledge that the feeling in favour of it was strong in the country and that there must be some basis for some arrangement of that kind. The proposal which he made would, he believed, meet the difficulty, and be just to the publican, while it would not cause any injustice to others concerned in the trade. What was at the bottom of the feeling was that the value of a licensed house was altogether different from the value of other businesses. The goodwill of an ordinary business was due to the energy and good management of the owner or to the particular position of the house, but the goodwill of a licensed house had, in addition, a value due to the monopoly given to it by the State. That was worth twelve or thirteen years purchase, while the ordinary goodwill of an ordinary business was worth only two or three years purchase. Everyone acknowledged that the growth of the monopoly value had been a misfortune and a mistake and it would be far better if the country could obtain that value for itself. What he proposed was that they should give an absolute right to the owner of a licensed house, till 1914. that no licence should be granted within a certain distance of his house and that during those ten years he would continue to have his monopoly value. If they did that they could at the end of that time quite reasonably and justly treat his licence as a new one, put it on the seven years system proposed for new licences, and obtain the monopoly for the public generally, instead of for individual owners. He was not bound to the terms of the distribution of the compensation embodied in his Amendment, and only put them forward as a basis for compromise. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 28, to leave out from from the word 'Act' to the end of Sub-section (1), and insert the words 'the following sums shall be paid as compensation to the persons concerned.

'(a) To all persons employed in or about the licensed premises in conection with the sale of intoxicating liquors, three months wages or salary;

'(b) To the occupier of the said premises, a sum equal to two years profits calculated on the average of the last five years, and also the difference between the value of the stock and fittings in the premises, as valued between an ingoing and outgoing tenant and their value for removal and sale;

'(c) To the owner of the said premises, the cost of any structural alterations necessary to adapt the premises to other uses than the sale of intoxicating liquors, such amount not to exceed two years annual value;

'(d) If the renewal be refused before the thirty-first day of December, 1914, then there shall be paid in addition to compensation as above to the owner of the said premises a sum equal to the average annual profits calculated as above multiplied by the number of years unexpired between the date of the refusal of the licence and the thirty-first day of December, 1914.' "—(*Mr. Seely.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'a sum' stand part of the clause."

SIR EDWARD CARSON said it was impossible for the Government to accept the Amendment. Grave injustice would be done if the compensation was distributed on the basis proposed. The occupier of the premises was to get exactly the same amount of compensation, whether he was merely the manager or the holder of the substantial interest of a lease. It was perfectly evident that that could not be just. All the owner was to get was the sum necessary to structurally alter the premises for the carrying on of another business, without relieving him of the covenants into which he might have entered by reason of the premises being licensed. That really was no compensation at all. The hon. Gentleman had asked him whether the holder of the licence would be allowed for fittings under the scheme of compensation proposed in the Amendment of the Home Secretary. It was a little out of place to discuss that proposal now, but as they might not come to that Amendment—[HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.] Everybody knew that the Amendment might not be reached.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs): So did the Government when they framed the guillotine.

SIR EDWARD CARSON said that if the Amendment were not reached, it would be due to the protracted discussions on the first clause of the Bill. But his answer to the question was that the whole question of the loss sustained by the holder by reason of his being deprived of his licence would be taken into account.

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.) said that this was the proper occasion, and the only occasion, for the discussion of the important question as to how the compensation money was to be distributed among the various persons entitled to share in it. The Solicitor-General had referred to the Home Secretary's Amendment ten pages lower down, and had reproached them for occupying time on other Amendments. But the useful discussions that afternoon had been initiated by Members sitting on the Government Benches. Therefore it was not judicious for the Solicitor-General to have raised such an issue. This was the only opportunity that would be available for placing what was a real grievance before the House and the country. The very fact that the Home Secretary had put down an Amendment, which would never be reached for discussion, showed that the Bill as it stood was inequitable, or at least did not provide an equitable solution of the problem of the distribution of the compensation. It was quite clear that as the Bill was framed the only person who would receive anything, in the vast majority of cases, would be the brewer, and not the person actually engaged in the business. The Government had awakened to the fact that their proposal would not bear examination, or might have unpleasant results outside, and so they had tardily put down an Amendment, in the name of the Home Secretary, which proposed to add at the end of Sub-section 2—

> "Having regard in the case of the licence-holder not only to his legal interest in the premises but also to his conduct and to the length of time during which the has been the holder of the licence, and the holder of a licence shall (notwithstanding any agreement to the contrary) in no case receive a less amount than he would be entitled to as tenant for a year, or from year to year, of the licensed premises."

He had not the least notion how a valuer was going to work in order to find out what was the amount to which a man was entitled as tenant for a year or from year to year, which was a totally different thing, but in some way or other, by some oblique process of reasoning, his conduct was to come into question in determining the true scale of remuneration. He could only say, as a practical man, that the wording of the section was too obscure to be worthy of any consideration.

They, therefore, came back to the Amendment of the hon. Member for Lincoln. He could not pledge himself to support all the proposals of the hon. Member's Amendment, but he hoped that it might become a substantive question in order that the Committee might be enabled to deal with the whole question of the distribution of the compensation fund. But there were one or two features about the Amendment which deserved the sympathetic consideration of the House. In the first place it singled out as deserving of a share, at any rate, in the fund not merely the owner and occupier, but the persons employed in the business and who obtained their livelihood by a continuance of the licence. For his part he could not regard any scheme of compensation as satisfying the necessities of the case which left unprovided for those persons who were pursuing a perfectly honourable calling and who found their means of livelihood suddenly put an end to through the operation of the Bill. He hoped, therefore, that the Committee would affirm that the *employés* of the licence-holder had an equitable title to a share in the fund. The hon. Member then distinguished between the case of the owner and the occupier. It was absolutely essential, if justice was to be done in this matter, that the occupier should have a first charge on the fund. It was not the great brewers that would suffer from the suppression of licences; on the contrary, in many instances they would positively gain from their reduction. On the other hand, the individual publican, whatever be his legal *status*, whether tenant, manager, agent, or trader by commission, was the man actually carrying on the business and was the first person to suffer if it was suppressed. Both in respect of the occupier and the owner the Amendment of the hon. Member proposed to limit the amount of compensation on a rational and satisfactory basis. But the Government having put down an Amendment in a place on the Paper where it would never be reached, which it was impossible to construe and difficult to understand, and the hon. Member having at this stage put down in plain language a proposition which everyone could follow, this was the appropriate moment to discuss the whole question.

SIR EDWARD CARSON said that the right hon. Gentleman apparently desired to discuss the whole question now. But it should be observed that the whole question had not been gone into by the mover of the Amendment. Personally he had not the least objection at the first moment to discuss the subject in its entirety, for he thought that the right hon. Gentleman would acquit him of any desire to shirk the discussion of any point that might arise on the Bill.

MR. ASQUITH pointed out that the Government was appealing to the Committee to discuss the question under conditions which made it impossible to do so adequately.

SIR EDWARD CARSON said that the moment the right hon. Gentleman was disposed to issue a challenge on the issue he should be prepared to deal with the question. The right hon. Gentleman, moreover, was absolutely wrong when he said that after some hesitation the Government had at length put down the Amendment giving a portion of the compensation fund to the manager. On the first day in Committee he stated that the opinion of the Government was that any holder of a licence, manager or otherwise, was a person interested in the licensed premises; and when the hon. Member for Leeds challenged that opinion he had stated that if it were not so he was prepared to put down an Amendment to make the point perfectly clear. The Government were now told that in putting this Amendment on the Paper, they had placed it there with some ulterior motive, and because they had been driven to do so by persons who were largely interested in public-houses. Such a view came very well from those who had constituted themselves the champions of these managers, from those who had in the first instance tried to destroy all their interests, who had tried to make the various persons interested strangle each other. This new-born enthusiasm for the persons who were engaged in the public-house business was as amusing as it was amazing. The Amendment which the right hon. Gentleman had ridiculed ran as follows—

> "Having regard in the case of the licence-holder not only to his legal interest in the premises but also to his conduct and to the length of time during which he has been the

holder of the licence, and the holder of a licence shall (notwithstanding any agreement to the contrary) in no case receive a less amount than he would be entitled to as tenant for a year, or from year to year, of the licensed premises."

Those words, which seemed to be strangely unfamiliar to the right hon. Gentleman, were taken from the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, which contained a special provision for persons holding a tenancy from year to year. As a matter of practice many tenants of licensed houses held an agreement for three months; some were managers, and some were weekly, some monthly, and some three or six monthly tenants. Although these agreements were short, they had continued in many cases for a considerable time. The Government had therefore said that it was fair in these cases, although the terms of agreement were short, for the holder of the licence to get at least the share of the compensation which a tenant from year to year would get. It was an advantage to make it clear that the person who held a weekly, monthly, or three-monthly tenure should receive an amount of compensation measured at least according to the same scale as if he held a tenancy durable from year to year. That was a very great benefit to these men. He saw no difficulty in having regard "not only to his legal interest in the premises, but also to his conduct and to the length of time during which he had been the holder of the licence." The man who held on a short agreement, continued year after year and renewed from time to time, had the same kind of equitable expectation as the owner of the house had in relation to the licence for which compensation was being set up under the Bill. That being so, just as the claim to compensation was set up in consequence of the equitable expectation that the owner had, so this man who had been in that employment under a short agreement, ought to have his right recognised by quarter sessions. And why should the right hon. Gentleman throw ridicule upon the consideration of his conduct? Was it not well that the man who had conducted a house well should get more compensation?

MR. EMMOTT (Oldham): But why should the brewer get less under those circumstances?

Sir Edward Carson.

SIR EDWARD CARSON replied that it was a matter of extreme importance to the brewer that the premises should be well conducted, otherwise he might lose the licence altogether. The Government endeavoured to put a premium upon the good conduct of the house, believing that the person who was in possession should have that inducement to carry on the premises properly. The bad conduct of a house might deprive the owner of a great deal of compensation, and it was not an unfair provision that if the licensee had conducted it well he should receive a larger amount of compensation. They had endeavoured to put a premium upon the good conduct of the house, and to do what was just and equitable as between the different parties.

*MR. J. H. LEWIS (Flint Boroughs) said the Solicitor-General stated that he had dealt with all the main points raised during the discussion. But in the course of the two speeches he had delivered he had not made the slightest allusion to that part of the Amendment which provided that compensation should be paid—

"(a) To all persons employed in or about the licensed premises in connection with the sale of intoxicating liquors, three months wages or salary."

He knew the case of a brewer who had received in licences from the public a monopoly value to the extent of £100,000, and they were now asked to compensate him to the fullest possible extent for any licence taken away for public purposes. The persons employed in those licensed premises had as great a moral right to share in the compensation fund as the brewer. The Prime Minister asked them to consider the broad equities of this case. He thought this Bill stood on very narrow grounds if it excluded from its equities all those persons employed in connection with licensed premises, many of whom had spent practically the whole of their lives, working long hours. The broad equities of the case demanded that those people should receive that fair treatment which the Bill did not give them. The Solicitor-General said it was impossible to accept this Amendment because the whole Bill was based upon depreciation of property. He commended that statement to the notice of the Committee, because they had always been told that there were great questions of morality involved. Now the reason given was depreciation of property, and personal claims were entirely ignored. He wished to draw the Solicitor-General's attention to an Amendment on page 35 in the name of the Home Secretary which was as follows—

> "In page 2, line 10, at end, to insert the words 'having regard in the case of the licence-holder not only to his legal interest in the premises but also to his conduct and to the length of time during which he has been the holder of the licence, and the holder of a licence shall (notwithstanding any agreement to the contrary) in no case receive a less amount than he would be entitled to as tenant for a year, or from year to year of the licensed premises.'"

He could quite understand that a licence-holder under very short notice was going under this Amendment to receive not less than twelve months compensation, but what he wished to know was whether a tenant who might be entitled to a longer period than one year could contract himself out of this Amendment in respect of that longer period? If he could contract himself out of it then the position was that a man under a week's notice who had been there for only a few weeks or months was entitled to exactly the same compensation as the man who had been there for twenty or twenty-five years and whose conduct was irreproachable. Was it possible for the latter individual to contract himself out of his rights or, in the words of the parable of the vineyard, was the man who had worked one hour entitled to one penny and the man who had worked twelve hours only entitled to the same amount?

SIR EDWARD CARSON said there were many considerations which hung together in regard to this matter. He did not know whether, for instance, the hon. Member meant to say that no lessee was to be allowed to contract himself out; if so, that was the intention of the Government. It was absurd to lay down that a man who was going to take a lease of his premises should not enter into any contract he pleased. The men they had to protect were those men who had short tenancies who were really in the nature of employees or managers and not lessees at all. They had proposed an enactment that, notwithstanding any contract entered into, they were to get at least one year's compensation.

*MR. J. H. LEWIS said the reply of the right hon. Gentleman was perfectly clear and they now knew that these men who had been tenants of licensed premises for a very long period of years were to be free to contract themselves out of the benefits of this clause.

SIR EDWARD CARSON said they had no such power, as there was no compulsion put upon those men.

*MR. J. H. LEWIS said he was referring to agreements made between landlord and tenant.

SIR EDWARD CARSON: Agreements for how long?

*MR. J. H. LEWIS said he meant from year to year. In future, in every case of agreements made between landlord and tenant, there would be a provision contracting them out of the interest they had in the licence. They were proposing to give to the man who had been in the house a few weeks the same compensation as the respectable and responsible tenant of irreproachable character, who had been in the business for twenty-five or thirty years. What equity was there in that? He had an Amendment on the Paper which he ventured to think met this case fully. It was on page 27—

> "In page 2, line 2, after the word 'shall' to insert the words 'after making equitable provision for the licence-holder and the persons usually employed in or about the licensed premises.'"

He asked the Government whether that was not a fair and equitable way of dealing with this question. When the meaning of the Government Amendment was fully realised, the people of this country would be more amazed than ever at the extraordinary inconsistencies of the Bill which they were now, under unfair limitations of time, endeavouring to discuss.

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

LICENSING BILL [2ND ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 2:—

Amendment again proposed.

"In page 1, line 28, to leave out from the word 'Act,' to the end of Sub-section (1), and insert the words 'the following sums shall be paid as compensation to the persons concerned:—

'(*a*) To all persons employed in or about the licensed premises in connection with the sale of intoxicating liquors, three months wages or salary.

'(*b*) To the occupier of the said premises, a sum equal to two years profits calculated on the average of the last five years, and also the difference between the value of the stock and fittings in the premises, as valued between an ingoing and outgoing tenant and their value for removal and sale.

'(*c*) To the owner of the said premises, the cost of any structural alterations necessary to adapt the premises to other uses than the sale of intoxicating liquors, such amount not to exceed two years annual value.

'(*d*) If the renewal be refused before the thirty-first day of December, one thousand nine hundred and fourteen, then there shall be paid in addition to compensation as above to the owner of the said premises a sum equal to the average annual profits, calculated as above multiplied by the number of years unexpired between the date of the refusal of the licence and the thirty-first day of December one thousand nine hundred and fourteen.'"—(*Mr. Seely.*)

Question again proposed, "That the words 'a sum' stand part of the clause."

MR. EDWARDS (Radnor) said the Solicitor-General had been twitting the right hon. and learned Member for Fife with his new-found enthusiasm for the trade. The right hon. and learned Gentleman seemed to be jealous of his right hon. friend's criticisms, as if he were poaching on his preserves, and wished to convey to the House the idea that "Codlin was the friend and not Short." It was time that his right hon. friend did show some enthusiasm, and he (Mr. Edwards) apprehended he was showing an enthusiasm which they all felt, and that was enthusiasm for justice, and inasmuch as he said the Bill did not do justice he protested against it, and supported the Amendment with enthusiasm, because it would do justice to a particular section of the trade. They had discussed the question of the amount to be given, and the time within which such compensation should be granted. Now the question was to whom should this compensation be paid? He himself thought there could be but one real act of justice, and that was to let compensation go in the direction proposed by the Amendment. He knew that brewers had great expectations under this Bill, but it would be fair that these expectations to some extent should be lessened. The publicans ought to have a larger share of compensation than the Bill proposed. Practically it gave most compensation to the brewers. That was an injustice, because they took most of the profits. They took profits as manufacturers, and also on the sale of beer, but the publican had only one. The tenant, according to the Bill, was to find the compensation money, and under these circumstances the least they could do was to give him a proper and fair compensation when he was dispossessed of his licence. The theory was that the more licences there were reduced the more was the value of the remaining houses increased. If that were so, the more would they be increasing the brewers' profits by reducing the houses. He had received a letter from a tenant who felt his position very keenly. He wrote—

"The Government Licensing Bill appears to me to be a brewers' Bill and nothing more. It appears to be for their benefit solely, and leaves the unfortunate tenant to look after himself. If I read the Bill aright, the tenant is to find the money for the purchase of a licence, and if someone in the House of Commons would find what benefit the tenant would get from his outlay, he would confer a benefit upon many licence-holders."

It was said that the tied houses numbered about 80 per cent. in the country. If that were so it was a serious matter, because a large number of tenants would get no compensation. That fact made him anxious to support the Amendment. There were in three small towns in his own county forty-six public-houses. Half of them were tied houses, and, therefore, 50 per cent. of the tenants would not, under this Bill, get substantial justice, unless the Amendment were agreed to. The hon. Member for Flint Boroughs had referred to the fact that the brewers might get the tenants to contract out the benefits of the Bill as regarded compensation. They knew enough to imagine what the position of that tenant would be who refused to agree to what the owner or brewer wanted him to do. His position would not be a pleasant one.

*Dr. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) said he regarded with great interest the Amendment of the hon. Member for Lincoln which, amongst other things, suggested that the employees should receive three months salary, for the reason that he had himself put down an Amendment, the object of which was to include in the persons to receive compensation the employees. He need not labour the point. The calling was an arduous and exacting one, honourably carried out, and the employees were almost always overworked and frequently underpaid. He had listened to the Solicitor-General, who had made two speeches, which he said completely covered all the points of the Amendment and the speeches made in regard to it; but it was rather significant that the hon. and learned Gentleman did not mention one word about the employees. There was a grim significance about that omission which ought not to be lost on the working classes. The Government at the last general election posed as the friend of the working classes. The right hon. Member for West Birmingham, speaking on the 19th September, 1900, in the middle of the election, asked to whom the working classes of this country owed all the legislation which benefited their condition, and said they would find it was the Unionist Party at the election; and that statement appeared in an exaggerated form in every Tory pamphlet. That being so, he was entitled to ask now what the Government were going to do with regard to the employees. On this occasion deeds and not words were wanted. The Solicitor-General was good enough to say that the basis of compensation in each case was the depreciation of property. The employee's property was his labour, which was not only depreciated but wiped out of existence when the house was shut up. The working classes of this country were very happy-go-lucky and looked to their own interests last of all, but he believed the limit of human endurance had been reached, and that the working classes of this country, when the opportunity, now long denied, was given to them, would mete out to the Government the treatment the Government were now meting out to them.

*Mr. J. A. PEASE (Essex, Saffron Walden) said the excuse put forward by the Government for this Bill was that it would reduce the number of licences. The Committee knew from the speeches delivered in the country and on behalf of the Bill, such as the speech of the hon. Member for Ripon on the Second Reading, that the reason why licences had not been reduced up to the present was not because of any particular hardship from the point of view of the brewers but from the point of view of the tenant. Over and over again they had been told that it was the tenant who ought to be compensated, and it was because of the gross hardships inflicted on the tenant that the magistrates had not taken advantage of their power to reduce licences under the existing law. This Bill now almost entirely sacrificed the tenant and handed over the compensation to the brewer landlord. The licensee was a person selected for his good character and his knowledge of the business: and if he were dispossessed he would have great difficulty in following another calling at the moment. Therefore if he was to be dismissed he should receive a large compensation under this Bill. The Solicitor-General had said that under this Bill he would receive compensation. That was not plain from the Bill; but, even if it were so, the compensation to be received by him seemed to be most inadequate. He ought to receive not only compensation for goodwill but for everything he put into the business.

Sir EDWARD CARSON: Not good will.

*Mr. J. A. PEASE said he was certainly under the impression that the Home Secretary said that the man should be compensated for his goodwill, and the right hon. Gentleman instanced the case of a popular cricketer who took a house and drew together a large custom, and said he should certainly be compensated for his goodwill. He thought the Government were bound to secure to the tenant this goodwill in the event of his being dispossessed. In the debate on the Second Reading of the Bill, the Colonial Secretary said he was in favour of compensation being paid on similar lines to that paid under the Compensation for Accidents Act. In a case of this kind he thought they were justified in giving compensation to the publican who was dispossessed of his licence through no fault of his own. The Colonial Secretary said under the Compensation Act three years salary would be paid to the representatives of a man who through accident was disabled. His Amendment which appeared on the Notice Paper suggested two years salary to the dispossessed tenant. The belated proposal of the Government would only give one year, and nothing to the dispossessed staff whatever. His complaint against the Government was that they had looked after the interest of the brewer instead of looking after the interest of the publican and his staff. He should like to see an Amendment introduced which would give to the staff not less than three months salary. In many cases six months salary would be more suitable. He did not suppose that in this case the Committee would hear any speeches from the hon. Member for Salford or the hon. Member for South Derbyshire. They knew very well that the Government had voiced their views in the debate. Hon. Members on the Opposition side of the House who had supported the principle of compensation would vote in favour of this Amendment with a great deal of pleasure, believing that it was due to the workers connected with the trade.

Mr. BOUSFIELD (Hackney, N.) said there was a provision included in sub-clause (a) which was really the logical sequence of the Amendment the Home Secretary had put down. He asked the Government to reconsider at some future stage the question raised by the Amendment in order to see whether they could not make this concession on behalf of the employees. This case differed from the ordinary compensation case. In the case of a grocer's shop taken for public purposes a person employed in the shop might be subject to a month's notice, and it would be absurd to give him three months compensation for disturbance. The grocer could remove elsewhere and open a shop and continue to give employment to the shopman, but a publican whose licence was not renewed could not do that. The employees of the publican were thrown on the market as unemployed, and he thought their case might receive a little consideration from the Government. He suggested that they should consider the question between now and the Report stage.

Mr. ROBSON (South Shields) said he desired to express his agreement with the arguments used on the Opposition side of the House on the question of compensation, but they did not in any way overstate the importance of the Amendment. The Amendment put down by the Government was a perfectly futile one. The Amendment of the hon. Member for Lincoln would at least secure some share of the compensation fund not only to the barman but also to the publican. The Amendment put down by the Government would not secure more than a nominal share of the fund to the publican, because the Government Amendment only operated in default of agreement. The Government Amendment was that if the parties agreed to a sum by way of compensation then that should be the sum awarded by quarter sessions. What did that mean? It meant the right of contracting out.

Sir EDWARD CARSON said there was another Amendment dealing with default of agreement on the Paper.

Mr. ROBSON replied that that was the Amendment he was going to deal with. On page 31 there was an Amendment striking out the words "in default of agreement," and substituting other words. He would undertake to say that that Amendment was merely one of drafting except in the particular that the agreement to be arrived at by the parties was to be subject to the approval of quarter sessions. He rather imagined quarter sessions would be apt to take the view of the Solicitor-General and say that where the publican and the brewer had come to an agreement under which the amount of compensation was to be paid to the publican it should be nothing more than nominal. They were free contracting parties; they were not Chinese labourers. [AN HON. MEMBER: They might be.] Quarter sessions would say, "What is there in the Bill to compel us to interfere with a free and voluntary contract entered into to reduce the amount of compensation to a mere nominal sum?" There was nothing in the Government Amendment to prevent it. That being so, one had the right to test the situation by the general argument used by the Solicitor-General in favour of the Bill.

The Law Officer of the Crown was all for free contract when they were trying to secure a share of compensation for the barman. What was a licence itself but a free contract for a year? A licence was a permission given by authority to the publican to open his public-house for a year, and he was expected to fulfil his obligation for that licence. It was a contract between him and the authorities. Why was the free contract to be sét aside? The claim of the licence-holder was founded upon a legitimate expectation of renewal of the licence. That was the foundation for the equity on which the Bill was based. But what about the barman? It was true that the barman might be in receipt of a weekly wage, but had he not a legitimate expectation. It was impossible when they left the sphere of free contract, as they did in the Bill, to distinguish logically and legitimately between landlord, tenant, and barman. Once they came to this element of expectation as the groundwork for statutory compensation, there was not any one of these three parties who was not equally entitled to be considered along with the other. Could it be said that they were being considered equally? The barman was omitted altogether, and the publican was having the substantiality of his position put at the mercy of an agreement. Were there any kind of limits except the approval of quarter sessions to that agreement? None. They knew what that would amount to. The Solicitor-General said that where a man had been a long time in the service, and had shown good conduct, that ought to be taken into consideration by quarter sessions. But what was there to prevent the landlord from giving notice as soon as he thought that compensation was likely to come into the question. There was nothing to prevent him from changing his barman or tenant, and quarter sessions had no power go into that Therefore the power of quarter sessions was a sham. It was one of those illusory provisions of which this Government was so fond in all their measures—intended not for actual working, but for election meetings.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich) said the Government had not made it clear what they intended to do to help these men, though throughout the debate sympathy had been expressed with them. There was an Amendment stating in legal language what was to be done, but the people who would have to deal with these matters would fail to understand what the Solicitor-General really wanted to do. Workmen had had a large experience of Acts of Parliament passed in their interest, but when it came to interpretation they got several learned gentlemen arguing different ways. Several hours had been spent lately in arguing whether a well 200 feet deep was a building thirty feet high. Could they not put into the Bill something in ordinary or "garden" language by which a man could understand whether he was to get compensation or not? When the Solicitor-General was cross-examining the mover of the Amendment, how was any small man to understand if he was to get compensation under this Bill? He himself could put it into Whitechapel-English, but the average man did not possess a cultivated intelligence, and he had heard many things in the House which he did not profess to understand. The right hon. Gentleman had said that the sole interest of the Government was, by this Bill, to promote the well-being of the community; that it was a great temperance measure; that it was going to shut up many nuisances; that, if two houses out of five were shut, it would be an advantage to the other three in the trade; and that the Bill was to be a great reform. But when they abolished vestries and school boards it was put in the Bill that every man who lost his situation was to be adequately compensated. Of course, that was an arrangement for the professional class, but it was quite different in the case of the average working man. It was all right in the case of a man that could be dubbed "John Brown, Esquire." He himself had been dubbed "Esquire"; but it was not very good stuff to feed children on—not very fattening or comforting.

He wanted to ask Gentlemen in the House who were really interested in the Bill in a general way—not personally or financially interested — whether they would persuade the Government to frame a clause to give compensation to these poor men. They said to these poor men, "Believe me, we are with you; and we want to give you compensation." Sympathy was very cheap, but it ought not to be beyond the wit of the Government to frame a clause to give compensation to these poor men. If the licence-holder was simply the servant of a brewery or distillery company and never went into the house, the business being conducted by a manager, the former would not expect to get anything, and the latter would not have a legal claim. Would the Government insert a clause providing that, where there were no persons financially interested in the licence, there should be a corresponding reduction in the amount of compensation to be awarded for that particular house. He knew scores of publicans who would not get a penny under this Bill, not even if the Home Secretary's Amendment was carried. He contended that this Bill would be a positive injury to the manager or licence-holder, and that it would not effect the reforms which it was claimed it would effect unless a good many of the Amendments on the Paper were adopted. But in an hour hon. Members would be ordered out of the House as in licensed premises by someone getting up and saying, "Time, please." That was the way they were now doing the nation's business. He pleaded in the interests of these poor men and barmaids in the tied houses who were the slaves of the brewers, and who, when the house was shut up, would find it difficult to turn their hands to anything else.

Mr. SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid.) said that a whole evening of Parliamentary time would not be more than adequate to discuss this Amendment. The Committee had not had before them a full explanation of the proposals of the Government in regard to the distribution of the amount of compensation. The basis for claiming compensation under the Bill was that the person must be interested in the licensed premises. Whatever words might be added at the end of Sub-section 2 would be governed by the consideration that the foundation of the title to compensation was interest in the licensed premises. Regard ought to be had, not merely to the persons interested in the premises, but to those interested in the trade conducted on the premises. In the first place there were those who were employed on the premises. It was quite clear that they were not interested in the licensed premises. In the next place there was the occupier of the premises, who was not always the licence-holder, and he would not be entitled to any compensation under the Bill. The classes whose interests were most carefully and minutely safeguarded by the Bill were the owners of the premises, the lessees, or the mortgagees. Unless the Amendment was adopted, the other classes he had referred to would suffer hardship, and receive no compensation. In many cases the occupier would get nothing under the Bill. The licence-holder was often not the occupier at all, but the nominee or secretary of a brewery company. Under the suggested Amendment of the Home Secretary compensation was to be given, "having regard in the case of the licence-holder not only to his legal interest in the premises, etc." Now in such a case the occupier had no legal interest in the premises at all, while the licence-holder had his salary from the brewery company. He observed that the activity of hon. Gentlemen opposite increased as the time when the guillotine was to drop approached. He only wished to point out that the words proposed by the Government would be entirely futile to carry out the object they said they had in view. The persons who would suffer most if a licence were not renewed were not the brewers, or even the licence-holders, but the persons who were employed. He thought, therefore, that the Government should adopt some such Amendment as had been proposed.

LORD WILLOUGHBY DE ERESBY (Lincolnshire, Horncastle) said he was personally somewhat disappointed that the Committee had not heard from the Government that they were prepared to introduce an Amendment which would give effect, in part, to the Amendment moved by his hon. friend. He had always held that, when anything was taken away for the public good, the person from whom it was taken should receive adequate compensation. If it were conceded that the number of public-houses should be reduced, then everyone who suffered by such reduction should be compensated. That view was now entertained by hon. Gentlemen opposite; and he was very glad that they had been converted to it. He hoped that when they were in office they would bear in mind the precept they had laid down in connection with the Amendment. He would strongly urge on the Government the desirability of taking into consideration the employees of public-houses that might be suppressed. He fully realised that the brewers would have to pay a large sum towards compensation; he believed it was the brewer, and not the publican, who would pay; and, therefore, the brewer would naturally have the first claim to the compensation. But, at the same time, it would be just, it would ease the passage of the Bill, if it were arranged that the employees should receive a share of the compensation. It might be said that it would be ridiculous to compensate a man who might only have been engaged a week; but, even in that case, he might have had to move his furniture and incur expense; and he should therefore be compensated. Employees in public-houses would not be able to secure other employment at a moment's notice; and, perhaps in a single day, a large number of barmaids and barmen would be thrown out of employment. Therefore, he sincerely trusted that the employees would receive compensation.

SIR ROBERT REID said he had always thought that the Conservative Party would have reason to repent of the principles on which this Bill was based. The fifty minutes still remaining were inadequate for the discussion even of this Amendment. Expectation had been made the ground for compensation, and now they had a multitude of people coming forward to share in this compensation. According to the Bill, all the compensation belonged solely to the owner of the house, who in most cases was the brewer, for whose benefit the Bill was introduced. Now the Government had put down an Amendment to provide that the tenant should have compensation. The next class put forward, and by no means the last—he did not see why the commercial traveller who called at the house was not equally entitled to compensation—the next class was the servants, the barmen and barmaids. He saw no reason why they should not be compensated. The Bill left it uncertain whether the profits were to be bought and paid for or not, and whether the profits were to be merely the profits of the retail business on the premises or were to include the brewers profits. The Government's proposed Amendment did not settle these points. The Bill provided that the compensation was to be calculated as if the Bill had not become law. That was the language appropriate to what was known as the "sterilisation" clause, but how was it applicable to a Bill to be operative ten, twenty, forty, fifty, sixty, seventy years hence? It was drawing language from one statute and placing it in a Bill without any real, adequate appreciation of what its effect was on that Bill. The Solicitor-General had offered to make an Amendment, of which he approved, to the effect that the premises hereafter should be valued upon the footing that the tenure was as precarious as it was to-day. But how was that to be estimated? What would be the case twenty years hence? There might be a public-house which was now worth £2,000 a year which would be worth £5,000 a year twenty years hence. The Government had taken language wholly inappropriate and put in a provision which was wholly unmeaning. He would not spend any further time on the clause. The fact was, the proceedings of this Committee were a perfect farce.

Mr. SEELY said he desired to thank those hon. Members who had supported his Amendment. He was not a member of the legal profession, and he did not claim that the wording of his Amendment was absolutely accurate. When the Solicitor-General pointed out that he had not provided in his Amendment for the case of an occupier with a long lease the right hon. Gentleman was perfectly accurate, and words would have to be inserted to secure that object. He should like to point out that his proposal was not intended as a hostile Amendment, but it was intended purely to provide an alternative system to the one which the Government had adopted. The fact that since he had put down his Amendment the Government had put down an Amendment on the same point was sufficient to show that there was a demand for the proposal he had made and some justification for it. Several hon. Members had suggested alternative proposals, but he preferred the general principle of his own proposal to any of the others. He should like to point out that the grave fault in the Amendment put down by the Home Secretary was that if a brewer had a good tenant he would be fined for it. Suppose a brewer had a house worth £5,000, and he had a tenant with a good character—that tenant might receive £1,000 and the brewer £4,000. If the brewer had a tenant with a bad character, in the case he had mentioned the tenant would get £100 and the brewer £4,900. Therefore the man with a good tenant would get considerably less than the man with a bad tenant. That was a fatal objection to the proposal made by the Government which practically left the different people concerned to quarrel amongst themselves as to how this money was to be divided. He thought his proposal was the best one, because it settled how much compensation each person concerned was to receive. With regard to the remarks made by the hon. and learned Member for Dumfries he had said very truly that this Amendment might be divided into two parts, firstly, how to divide the compensation; and secondly, the question of the amount. In regard to the question as to how the compensation should be divided he was prepared to accept any Amendments which were reasonable, but he thought that the principle which he had adopted, namely, that of giving so much to the person employed, so much to the person in occupation, and so much to the owner, was a reasonable and wise principle, and one which he should be glad to see adopted. As was pointed out by the noble Lord the Member for Horncastle, the Prime Minister proposed that a considerable number of houses should be abolished, and under those circumstances a large number of persons might be thrown out of employment. He should be glad if the Government could make some arrangement to compensate those persons. As to the amount of compensation he acknowledged that the question had been fully discussed upon the subject of the time limit, and that point had already been decided by the Committee. His idea in putting down this Amendment was to make the whole principle more complete and to secure that the various persons concerned should receive compensation for any kind of interest they might have in a house which was closed. He wished the occupier to be compensated for his interest and the owner compensated as the ordinary owner and also for his further interest as the owner of a monopoly, which, quite unintentionally, the State had given to him. He did not bind himself to the particular form in which his Amendment was drawn, and he could quite imagine that some other form of words might be better. He thought it would be a wise arrangement for the Government to make if they adopted some proposal by which these different interests were divided and provided for. He should be glad if the Government could see their way either to adopt or amend his Amendment, or, at any rate, give them some assurance that they would adopt the principle it contained.

*Mr. REA (Gloucester) said the proposal before the House was a substantial Amendment, for it gave a share of the compensation to the licence-holder and to all who had an interest in the premises. Hon. Members on both sides of the House had expressed themselves in favour of giving compensation to these people. There was an alternative before the Committee in the shape of three Amendments put down on the Paper in the name of the Home Secretary. It appeared to him that those three Amendments taken together did not with any certainty give any share of compensation to the persons he had alluded to. The first Amendment was on page 31, and it applied to the fixing of the whole sum of compensation which had to be paid for the withdrawal of a licence, and it had no relation whatever to the division of the compensation. The second of the three Amendments to which he alluded, which would be found on page 33, did include the holder of the licence among those persons amongst whom the compensation was to be divided, but it did not say how the compensation was to be divided. The third Amendment he alluded to was on page 35, and it gave an instruction to quarter sessions as to what they were to bear in mind in dividing the compensation, but this only applied to those cases which came before quarter sessions, and the only cases which quarter sessions had anything to say to were the cases in which no agreements existed. It appeared to him that the Amendment of the hon. Member for Lincoln did definitely give a share of the compensation to the holder of the licence and to those employed in the public-house, whilst the three Amendments of the Home Secretary taken together did not secure any such compensation for the persons he had mentioned. He preferred, for these reasons, the Amendment of the hon. Member for Lincoln to the three Amendments put forward by the Home Secretary, and he should heartily vote for it.

*MR. EMMOTT said it was clear, not only that the discussion in so limited a time of Clauses 2 and 3 was a sorry farce, but that the Bill as originally drawn gave everything to the brewer. The Home Secretary's Amendment, giving a small share to the licence-holder, although it might have been foreshadowed by the Solicitor-General about June 9th, was not put down for a month and not till the closure by compartment was carried. It was an insult to the House to put down sweeping Amendments at so late a stage, when the Committee could not discuss them. The Government up to now had not told them whether they meant to do anything for the *employés* or not. Did the Government recognise that claim? The Committee had the right to an answer. It had been pointed out that if the tenant got more the owner must get less. The Solicitor-General had said that it was to the interest of the owner that the tenant should be a good one and remain long in the house, and so the value of the house would be raised. But why was it, if that were true, that the transfer of tied houses was three or four times as numerous as of other houses? It was because some of the owners preferred a frequent change of tenants, thinking that every new tenant brought new custom without losing much of the old and also because of the iniquitous character of many tied-house agreements. And what did the value of the house depend on in the long run? On the amount of drink sold. He wished to point out to the Solicitor-General that the statement he made that it was to the interest of the tied-house owner to keep his tenant as long as possible was not borne out by facts. He could produce very many instances in which complaint had been made not of the character of the man but because he had not sold enough drink. That was what the tied-house owner looked to, and everybody who knew anything at all about this question knew that. Although he acknowledged the good intentions of this Amendment put forward by the Government he felt most strongly that the effect of the Bill would be to render still shorter the tenure of these tenants, and make it worse than it had been in the past.

SIR EDWARD CARSON said he had already spoken at considerable length upon this Amendment, but he desired to reply to some of the observations which had been made by the hon. and learned Member for Dumfries and other hon. Members. The hon and learned Member for Dumfries seemed to think that it was something novel to give compensation for the taking away of a licence, and he had stated that compensation hitherto had only been given when legal right was taken away, and that now they were giving it for an expectation. Did the hon. and learned Member say that if licensed premises had been taken away under the Lands Clauses Act, or for any purpose different from the question of renewal, no compensation would be given?

Sir ROBERT REID said a public authority buying public-house property had no right to interfere with the licence; if they took away the expectation of another person they must pay for it. But it was a very different thing when those who granted a licence upon an annual tenure claimed to exercise their legal right to discontinue it.

Sir EDWARD CARSON said the hon. and learned Gentleman's statement was that compensation had never hitherto been paid for a mere expectation. When licensed premises were taken under the conditions he had stated, they did not value the licence merely as a licence for one year. It might be valued as a licence for twenty-five years, and, even in the case of a reversion with an outstanding lease of twenty-five years, the Courts had held that the mere expectancy of the reversioner that the licence would be renewed from year to year was a matter for compensation. It was the foundation of the argument that they could not with any justice have two systems of legal right running side by side—one under which they deprived a man of what he possessed without a shilling, and the other under which they recognised to the fullest extent the legal expectancy that he had. Hon. Gentlemen were in favour of giving the *employé*, as contradistinguished from those interested in the licensed premises, some compensation. Had such a principle ever been admitted before? Even when a private individual or a company was authorised to take licensed premises compulsorily, and ordered to pay full compensation, the *employés* did not get a shilling. What was estimated was the depreciation of property, and that was the whole basis and foundation of the Bill. That might be right or it might be wrong, but what they said was that if a licence was taken away the compensation payable ought to be the difference between the value of the premises with the licence and their value without it. Any other system would be absolutely inconsistent with every principle of compensation when property was taken away for a public purpose which had ever been approved by Parliament. The Government Amendments, he submitted, went to the fullest extent to which the principle of compensation had ever gone. They really went further in including managers who were licence-holders. It was said that the bulk of the compensation would go to the owners, who, in many cases, were the brewers. He totally and absolutely denied it. That matter was left in the discretion of quarter sessions just as much as the question of what was to be given to the lessee.

Mr. ROBSON: In default of agreement.

Sir EDWARD CARSON said the hon. and learned Gentleman would find, if he looked at the Government Amendments, that he was mistaken.

Mr. ROBSON said that when it came to the distribution of the compensation fund quarter sessions had no jurisdiction except in default of agreement. Quarter sessions were entitled and bound to approve any agreement which fixed the amount of the compensation as between the persons interested in the premises. When they came to fixing the precise proportion in which each person should receive it, then quarter sessions had no jurisdiction except in default of agreement. Therefore, it all depended on the agreement.

Sir EDWARD CARSON said the hon. and learned Gentleman was mixing up two things. As regarded the amount of compensation to be fixed, no agreement between the parties would fix that without the confirmation of quarter sessions. When they came to the distribution of the money it was left to quarter sessions to determine the amount. [Mr. Robson: In default of agreement.]—The hon.

and learned Gentleman was quite mistaken. The clause said that the amount was to be divided amongst the persons interested "in such shares as may be settled by agreement, or, in default of agreement, determined by quarter sessions." The Government Amendment proposed to leave out "in default of agreement," so that he was absolutely right in saying that the whole question of what the owner was to get was to be determined by quarter sessions. Quarter sessions, in addition to assessing the value of the legal interest of the holder of the licence, who would either be the lessee or the manager, had also to take into consideration the conduct of the holder and the length of time he had been in possession. He submitted that the Government in thus framing their proposal were taking care, not only of the tenant, but of the manager, who in many cases might be only a simple *employé*. It had been asked why they did not do the same in regard to the other *employés*. His answer was that they looked upon the man who held the licence, and who was under pains and penalties for the proper conduct of the premises, as the person who ought to receive the compensation when the licence he held was taken away.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS asked what happened to the occupier of the premises when he was not the licence-holder and when the licence was in the name of the secretary to a brewery company?

SIR EDWARD CARSON thought that very often the transfer of a licence to the secretary of a company was only done whilst a new manager or tenant was being found.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said that what he wished to know was, in case the occupier was not the licence-holder, would the licence-holder get the compensation and the occupier get nothing.

SIR EDWARD CARSON said that would certainly be so. He had already explained that the licensing magistrates who had to deal with the licence-holder put pains and penalties upon him, and for that reason the licence-holder ought to be compensated if the licence was taken away. The hon. Member for Lincoln had said that if an owner happened to have had a bad tenant he would come out of it better than if he had had a good tenant. The Government thought that every encouragement ought to be given to the tenant who conducted his premises in a satisfactory way, and therefore they said that he should be compensated at a higher rate than the tenant who did not conduct his premises in a proper manner. Was it true, as was said by the hon. Member for Lincoln, that the owner would suffer by this proposal? The Government contended that he would not. If a place was badly conducted there was the danger of having convictions endorsed upon the licence, and anyone about to purchase a public-house in the market would look at the register in order to see whether convictions had been recorded, because if the licence had been previously endorsed there would be the danger that the whole licence might be taken away upon another conviction, and the whole value of the licensed premises might thereby be lost. He claimed that under this Bill the owner of the premises was interested in encouraging the licensee to conduct his premises properly.

MR. SEELY asked if the right hon. Gentleman really meant to say that if there had been a new man put in the premises during the last six months the compensation would not be less than it would be to an old tenant?

SIR EDWARD CARSON said the proposal applied to his conduct as well as to the length of time. The Government wished to encourage good tenants to conduct the premises well for a length of time. He thought that the more the Amendment the Government had put upon the Paper was examined the more would it be seen to meet the justice of the case.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that the guillotine was working impartially. On Thursday last it was the British citizen's head that was cut off. To-night the publican's head was going to roll into the basket. The Solicitor-General had tried to explain that under this Amendment the publican was going to get his fair share of the compensation, but it was not the share promised by the Home Secretary. The Home Secretary, in his speech on the Second Reading of the Bill, said the goodwill of a house, and the trade done, often depended very largely upon the popularity of the licensee, and he mentioned the case of the professional cricketer who he thought ought to have a considerable share of the amount awarded. What share was he going to get? According to the theory of the Government,—and he hoped the publicans would notice it—the publicans would find that their compensation had been decreased by limiting the debates. After four or five days discussion they had been given one year's purchase, and probably with a few more days they would have got two or three years. The publican was now to get one year out of fifteen. That was the old cricketer's "considerable share." It seemed to him that the old cricketer was to hold the wicket but the brewer was to get the gate-money. Although they had only been able to discuss this Amendment very briefly they had at any rate made it clear that this was purely an electioneering Bill and simply a brewers' Bill. It was not the old cricketer who supplied the electioneering funds, but the great brewery syndicates, and it was for them and them alone that they were giving this compensation.

Mr. CROOKS: Time, Gentlemen, please?

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said that the Chairman was going to press the button, and he would therefore sit down.

And, it being Eleven of the clock, the Chairman proceeded, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 5th July, to put the Question on the Amendment already proposed from the Chair.

Question put, "That the words 'a sum' stand part of the clause."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 285; Noes, 181. (Division List No. 219.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, RtHonSir H.
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon A J(Manch'r)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, RtHn GeraldW(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R(Christch.
Banbury, Sir FrederickGeorge
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Lt.-ColHF(Middlesex)
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, J.H.M.(DublinUniv.
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W.(Derbyshire)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn JA(Worc.)
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Colomb, Rt. Hon. Sir John C.R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Crean, Eugene
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd(Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Saville
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, SirFredDixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir JohnE
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt.Hon.SirWilliamHart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson, RtHn.SirJ.(Manc'r)
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. EdwardAlgern'n
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, PhilipS.(Warwick,S.W.)
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn. J E(Elgin&Nairn)
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'rH'mlets
Gore, Hon. S.F.Ormsby-(Linc.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, SirEW(B'rySEdm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric

Hardy, Laurence (Kent Ashf'rd)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'h
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley)
Heath, James (Staffords. N.W.)
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham)
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kennaway, Rt. Hon Sir John H
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop)
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks. NR
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W (Evesham
Long Rt Hn Walter (Bristol, S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)
Lloyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W.F.
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H E (Wigt'n)
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt Hon. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan, Col. John P (Galway, N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington)
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W.W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir Harry S (Limehouse
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H.C (North'mb Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J G (Oxford Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thompson, Dr. E. C (Monagh'n, N
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tillett, Louis John
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield)
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt. Col. A. C. E. (Taunton)
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H. (Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Young, Samuel
Younger, William

Tellers for the Ayes.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Henry
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James.
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Condon, Thomas Joseph

Corbett, A.Cameron (Glasgow
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellice,CaptE.C(SAndrew'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans Sir Francis H(Maidstn
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (DerbyCo.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone, Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt.Hon.SirE.(Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, LewisV.(Rossendale)
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse RtHnH(Somers't E)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hutchison, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones DavidBrynmor(Swansea)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kemp, Lieut.-Colonel George
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan,W
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James.
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal,W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, SirJosephF.(Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J.Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Doherty, William
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Palmer, George Wm. (Reading)
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Reid, SirR.Threshie (Dumfries)
Reckitt, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A.(Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas, DavidAlfred(Merthyr)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, JohnCathcart(Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh.N.)
Woodhouse,SirJ.T.(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Mr. Charles Seely and Mr. Warner.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he wished to move that the vote of the hon. Member for Widnes recorded in the last division be disallowed, on the ground that he had direct pecuniary interest in the subject-matter upon which his vote was given. The effect of the Amendment, if carried, would have diminished the amount of compensation to go to the owner upon a licence being withdrawn. The servants on the licensed premises would have had their share of the compensation fund to the extent of three months wages or salary, and the occupier of the premises as his share would have had a sum equal to two years profits. The hon. Member for Widnes had a direct pecuniary interest, inasmuch as he was the owner of a considerable number of tied houses in Liverpool and other parts of Lancashire. He selected the hon. Member's vote for the Motion not from any personal motive. He did not want the hon. Gentleman or the House to believe that this was a personal attack, but he made the Motion to assert a very important principle. This was a question which ought to be left to the House to decide. He would quote the ruling of the Speaker on 30th April, 1901, given after the Prime Minister had endeavoured to draw a distinction between public and private Bills.

It was not a question of order, it was for the House on each occasion to weigh the advantages and decide. On 11th March, 1892, a Motion was made to disallow the votes of three Members in connection with the Mombasa Railway on the ground of pecuniary interest, and on that occasion the Prime Minister said the principle laid down by the Chair was that no Member should give a vote if his interest was of a direct and personal kind, but that principle must be interpreted by the particular occasion on which the House was called upon to apply it. A Committee sat in 1896 to consider this question, and Mr. Speaker Peel and the present Mr. Speaker declared it important that the House should decide on each particular case. He submitted that this was distinctly a case where it ought to be left to the House to decide. He disclaimed any intention of imputing any corrupt motive. He moved that the vote be disallowed.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am afraid I have very little to add to what I said the other night on the same matter. The hon. Member has practically raised the same point. I based myself on that occasion upon what is the latest pronouncement I can find from the Chair, a pronouncement made in 1898, and it arose on the Local Government (Ireland) Bill, 1898, on Report, Clause 42. That Bill provided for the payment of the landlord's share of the rates out of public money, whereupon an hon. Member raised the same point as the hon. Member has raised to-night, Mr. Speaker being in the Chair; and Mr. Speaker then said what I read out the other night, but for greater lucidity I will read it again —

> "The rule of the House is well understood that there must be a direct pecuniary interest of a private and particular, and not of a public and general nature, and where the question before the House is of a public and general nature, and incidentally involves the pecuniary interests of a class which includes Members of this House, they are not prevented by the rules of the House from voting. In the present case no question of privilege arises."

I can only use exactly the same expressions. Mr. Speaker ruled on that occasion, and did not leave the decision to the House, and I think I am bound to follow his precedent and to rule the same way in this case. What I understand to be the rule is really this — that if an hon. Member has a direct personal pecuniary interest or advantage which he or one or two of his fellows may derive from the passage of a particular Bill he is not entitled to vote upon it. For instance, if a Government proposed a Bill for acquiring property for the purpose of manœuvres on Salisbury Plain or for the establishment of docks in a particular port, then, if an hon. Member happened to be the individual whose land would be taken for that purpose — either for the purpose of manœuvres or docks — it is quite clear that he would have a direct personal pecuniary interet in that Bill passing; but if he was simply one of a class, whether brewers, or solicitors, or landlords, or tenants, or shipowners, or any other class, then the vote would not be disallowed.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE submitted that this was a different case from the Irish case. That was a Bill, not to give a pecuniary advantage to the landlords, but to establish local government in Ireland, though incidentally something was done to benefit the landlords. But this was a Bill—[MINISTERIAL cries of "Chair."] This was a totally different Bill. It was avowed by the Government that this was a Bill to establish compensation, and that was the main and chief object of the Bill. The Chairman had stated that Mr. Speaker's ruling in 1898 was the latest, but the latest ruling was given by Mr. Speaker in 1901.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I am afraid that I have nothing to add to what I have already said. The hon. Member has not convinced me that I was wrong on the previous occasion.

THE CHAIRMAN then proceeded successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments moved by the Government of which notice had been given, and on every Question necessary to dispose of the allotted business to be concluded on the 2nd allotted day.

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 2, line 4, to leave out the words 'in default of agreement,' and insert the words 'if an amount is agreed upon by the persons appearing to quarter sessions to be interested in the licensed premises and is approved by quarter sessions, be that amount, and in default of such agreement and approval shall.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 8, after the word 'premises,' to insert the words 'including the holder of the licence.'."—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 9, to leave out from the word 'be,' to the word 'determined,' in line 10."—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 10, at the end, to insert the words 'having regard in the case of the licence-holder not only to his legal interest in the premises but also to his conduct and to the length of time during which he has been the holder of the licence, and the holder of a licence shall (notwithstanding any agreement to the contrary) in no case receive a less amount than he would be entitled to as tenant for a year, or from year to year, of the licensed premises.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Question put, "That the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 280; Noes 174. (Division List No. 220.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hon.SirH.
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt.Hon.A.J.(Manch'r.
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour,Rt.Hn.GeraldW(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles,Lt.-Col.H.F(Middlesex)
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell,J.H.M.(DublinUniv.)
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich.)
Chamberlain,Rt.Hn J A(Worc.)
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H.A.E.
Colomb, Rt. Hon. Sir John C.R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Crean, Eugene
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd(Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland,Sir FredDixon
Doogan, P. C.
Dorington, Rt. Hon.Sir JohnE.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke,Rt.Hon.SirWilliamHart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson,Rt.Hn.Sir J.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald,Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon.Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S.(Warwick,S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn)
Gordon,MajEvans-(T'rH'mlets
Gore,Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,SirE.W.(B'rySEdm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hardy, Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath,Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords.N.W.)
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A.(Stafford,W.)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, John (Kent,Favershm
Hozier,Hon.James Henry Cecil
Hudson,George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex.)
Kennaway,Rt.Hon.Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hon.Geo.T.(Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson,JohnGrant(Yorks.N.R
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants.,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn.Walter (BristolS.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)

Lucas, Reginald J(Portsmouth)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (EdinburghW
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell,Rt Hn Sir HE(Wigt'n)
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner,Rt.Hon.Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon.J.Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan,DavidJ.(Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray,Rt.Hn.A.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan, Col.John P.(Galway,N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Kendal (TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington

Peel,Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hon.M.W.(Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde(Bethnal Green
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, SirHarryS(Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford,East)
Smith,H.C(North'mb.Tyneside
Smith, JamesParker(Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich
Stanley,Hon. Arthur(Ormskirk

Stanley, EdwardJas.(Somerset)
Stanley,Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J.M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Thompson,Dr.E.C.(Monagh'nN
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tillett, Louis John
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.SirC E H(Sheffield)
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby,Lt.-Col.A.C.E(Taunton)
Welby, Sir CharlesG.E.(Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York,E.R.)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H.(Yorks.)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt, Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Young, Samuel
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt Hon HerbertHenry
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Churchill, Winston Spencer

Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Delany, William
Dilke,Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellice,Capt.E C(SAndrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans,SirFrancis H.(Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph

Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E.(Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt,Lewis V. (Rossendale
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt.Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E

Kemp, Lieut.-Colonel George
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W.
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Doherty, William
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Palmer, George Wm. (Reading)
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries)
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Scott, Chas. Prestwick (Leigh)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

Clause 3:—

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 11, to leave out the word 'may,' and insert the words 'shall in each year, unless they certify to the Secretary of State that it is unnecessary to do so in any year.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 12, after the word 'all,' to insert the word 'existing.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 280; Noes, 156. (Division List No. 221.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Lt.-Col. H. F. (Middlesex
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, J. H. M (Dublin Univ.
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E
Colomb, Rt. Hon. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Crean, Eugene
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Doogan, P. C.
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-

Fitzroy, Hon. EdwardAlgernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S.(Warwick,S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn. J. E(Elgin&Nairn,
Gordon,Maj.-Evans(T'rH'mlets
Gore,Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,SirE.W.(B'rySEdm'nds
Greene, Henry D .(Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hardy, Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton,(Tynem'th
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath,Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords.,N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford,W.)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham)
Hozier, Hon. James HenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kennaway, Rt.Hn.Sir John H
Kenyon,Hon. Geo. T.(Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop,
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool,
Lawson, John Grant(Yorks.NR
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants.,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.Charles W.(Evesham,
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter (Bristol,S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Iver,Sir Lewis (EdinburghW.
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell,Rt.Hn.Sir H.E(Wigt'n
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, David J(Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray,Rt.Hn.A.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan, Col. John P.(Galway,N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease,Herbert Pike (Darlington
Peel, Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederick Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge
Ridley, S.Forde(Bethnal Green
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel,Sir Harry S.(Limehouse
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharve, William Edward T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Smith,H.C.(North'mbTyneside
Smith, James Parker(Lanark.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hon.Arthur(Ormskirk
Stanley, Edwd. Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.,
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thompson, Dr.EC(Monagh'n,N
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.SirC.E.H.(Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E.(Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G.E.(Notts.,
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton undLyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York,E.R.)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H.(Yorks.)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Young, Samuel
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
AsquithRt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)

Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Channing, Francis Allston
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark,
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Delany, William
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellice,Capt.EC(S.Andrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans,SirFrancis H.(Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Hall, Edward Marshall
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire)
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kemp, Lieut.-Colonel George
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan,W
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal,W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary,Mid
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A.(Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York,W. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse,SirJ.T.(Hudd'rsfi'd

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Mr. Whittaker and Mr. Theodore Taylor.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 13, to leave out the words 'granted or.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 16, at the beginning, to insert the word 'First.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 24, to leave out Sub-section (3), and insert the words, '(3) Such deductions from rent as are set out in the Second Schedule to this Act may, notwithstanding any agreement to the contrary, be made by any licence-holder who pays a charge under this section, and also by any person from whose rent a deduction is made in respect of the payment of such a charge.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, lines 33 and 34, to leave out the words 'or in respect of special payments for new licences.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Another Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 41, after the word 'Act,' to insert the words 'and such expenses of the justices of the licensing district incurred under this Act as quarter sessions may allow.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Another Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 7, at the end, to add the words, 'Quarter sessions shall in each year make such returns to the Secretary of State with respect to their own action, and that of the justices of licensing districts, under this Act, as the Secretary of State may require.'"—(*Mr. Solicitor-General.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Question put, "That the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill"

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 266; Noes, 160. (Division List No. 222.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hn.Sir H.
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt.Hn.A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour,Rt.HnGerald W(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Lt.-Col.H.F.(Middlesex
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell,J.H.M (Dublin Univ.
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon .Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish,V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain,Rt.Hn.J.A.(Worc
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Colomb,Rt.Hon. Sir John C.R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Crean, Eugene
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, W. Bromley
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland,SirFred Dixon
Doogan, P. C.
Dorington, Rt.Hn.Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants,W.)
Fergusson,Rt.Hn.Sir J.(Manc'r)
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald,SirRobert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hon.Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, PhilipS.(Warwick.S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hon.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn
Gordon,MajEvans (T'rH'mlets
Gore, Hon.S.F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,SirEW(B'ryS. Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hardy Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, ArthurHoward (Hanley
Heath, James(Staffords. N.W.)
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford,W.)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham)
Hozier,Hon.James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kennaway,Rt.Hn.Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hn.Geo.T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.(Salop.
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law,Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks.N.R.
Lee,ArthurH. (Hants.Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower,Frederick N.S.
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. CharlesW.(Evesham
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter (Bristol,S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas,Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttleton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver,SirLewis (Edinburgh,W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring,Hon. W.F.
Maxwell,RtHn.SirH.E (Wigt'n
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner,Rt.Hn.Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu,Hon.J. Scott (Hants)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan,David J.(Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray,Rt.Hn.A.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan,Col.John P.(Galway,N.)

Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J (Tipperary, N.)
O'Dowd, John
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pease, Herb. Pike(Darlington
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir Harry S. (Limehouse
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H. C. North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thompson, Dr. E C (Monagh'n, N
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H. (Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col A. C. E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W H (York.)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Aston, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allstone
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Delany, William
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellice, Capt. E C (S. Andrw's Bghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kemp, Lieut.-Colonel George
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W.
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Rose, Charles Day
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.

Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersfi'd

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur

And, it being after Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again to-morrow.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (SIR A. ACLAND-HOOD, Somersetshire, Wellington), in moving the adjournment of the House, said the Licensing Bill would be taken this day (Tuesday).

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said he could not make out exactly where the Licensing Bill came on the Order Paper. He presumed that some opportunity would be given of the House considering the question.

SIR A. ACLAND-HOOD: Perhaps the hon. Member will raise the question to-morrow.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the House do now adjourn."—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*)

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.) said he wished to call attention to the escape of two indentured Chinese labourers from Johannesburg to Pretoria and their capture in the latter place. When he referred to this matter upon a previous occasion the Colonial Secretary said that he had no information in regard to the imprisonment of these men. Naturally upon all questions affecting personal liberty Irishmen sympathised with the victims of oppression, and he wished to draw attention to the way the right hon. Gentleman had acted in this matter. On Friday last he asked the Colonial Secretary whether he had received the information which was conveyed to the public in a Reuter's telegram, stating that two of these Chinese labourers had escaped from the compounds at the mines, and had managed to get from Johannesburg to Pretoria, which was a distance of forty miles. Upon this point he did not think the Colonial Secretary had treated the House respectfully, because hon. Members were anxious to have the fullest information in regard to the administration of this Ordinance in South Africa. The right hon. Gentleman replied to him, stating that he would not telegraph, but he promised to communicate with Lord Milner by despatch. He had not telegraphed, and therefore it was the right hon. Gentleman's duty to have sent a despatch to Lord Milner by the mail which left for South Africa at two o'clock on Saturday. But there was something far worse connected with this matter, and they had only to look at this Ordinance itself in order to see the very stringent conditions under which these Chinese laboured.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member will not be in order in discussing that question, because there is a notice on the Paper in regard to that subject. He will not be out of order in asking for further information in answer to his questions about telegraphing.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL said that having regard to the heavy penalties to which these men were liable for escaping, he thought he would be justified in calling attention to those sections of the Ordinance under which they would be liable to punishment. These men were liable to a fine of £10, or one month's imprisonment, for escaping. Then there was the question of the liability of the Englishmen or Boers in Pretoria who had had any dealings with these escaped men. These two Chinamen were found at Pretoria, begging for work, and the men who gave them work were liable to a fine of £500 or two years imprisonment. These poor Chinamen could not have tramped forty miles, they must have gone by train and they must have been "harboured" by some persons, and the persons who harboured them were liable to a fine of £300, or two years imprisonment. Having regard to the awful penalties to which these Chinamen were subjected and the heavy penalties for harbouring them, he thought it was a matter which ought to be brought clearly before the notice of the House, because the House of Commons was responsible for the passing of this Ordinance. He thought they were entitled to the fullest information, and the Minister who endeavoured to conceal and keep from the House information in regard to the atrocities now being enacted, more especially when it had been said that Lord Milner did not care twopence for persons 6,000 miles away, was not treating the House of Commons with respect. The Colonial Secretary ought not to be simply the conduit pipe of Lord Milner, and he ought not to be allowed to treat the House of Commons with contempt. The institution of slavery in South Africa was an abominable thing.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland) said this was not a case of two coolies only, but it was much worse than that. According to the reports, some fifteen coolies had escaped and were seeking work in Pretoria and elsewhere. They had no means of judging whether these reports were true or not, but they had reached this country through well known agencies. He thought these facts justified them in asking that inquiries should be made from Lord Milner. It had been stated that some of these coolies had been arrested and brought before the magistrates, but they did not know whether they had been punished, or sent back to work, or whether they had been sent back to China. They had no information as to whether any persons had been arrested and charged under the Ordinance with harbouring escaped Chinamen. In view of the very great public interest taken in this matter throughout the country, he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would inform the House that he would either write or telegraph to Lord Milner for information upon the subject.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. LYTTELTON, Warwick and Leamington) said he thought it was undesirable constantly to harass with telegrams men who were already burdened with an excess of work. He thought that if he wrote in the ordinary course to Lord Milner and obtained the information desired that was all that could reasonably be demanded on the present occasion. For many years indentured labourers under Ordinances sanctioned by hon. Members opposite had been liable to penalties for desertion. That a few Chinamen out of more than a thousand had been said to have escaped was not sufficient ground, in his judgment, for telegraphing to Lord Milner or seeking information through other than the ordinary channels.

*MR. H. J. WILSON (Yorkshire, W.R., Holmfirth) complained that the manner in which the Colonial Secretary had answered questions on the subject was scarcely that which the House had a right to expect. The right hon. Gentleman appeared to have treated the House as well as his. hon. friend with something like contempt.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.) suggested that the Colonial Secretary should urge Lord Milner to have all these Chinamen sent from whence they came, and if he would insist upon proper wages being paid and provide the money for their passage he was sure plenty of white labour for the mines could be found in London.

*MR. CREMER (Shoreditch, Haggerston) asked whether the Colonial Secretary could state the exact number of Chinese who had made their escape. Was it two, seventeen or nineteen? Several conflicting statements had been made in regard to the number who had deserted.

MR. LYTTELTON rose to reply.

*MR. SPEAKER said the right hon. Gentleman had already exhausted his right to speak.

Question put, and agreed to.

INDIAN ARMY UNIFORMS.

Address for "Return of all changes in the regulations affecting the dress and equipment of officers in the Indian Army since November, 1902, showing, where possible, the approximate cost of the changes in each rank to the Officers concerned."—(*Sir Seymour King.*)

COUNTY OF SUFFOLK BILL.

Mr. Stuart-Wortley, Sir Cuthbert Quilter, and Mr. Goddard were nominated members of the Select Committee on the County of Suffolk Bill.—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*)

Adjourned at twenty minutes before One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 12th July, 1904.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Rotherham Corporation Bill. Moved, That the order made on the 14th day of March last, "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 16th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2ª; agreed to; Bill read 2ª accordingly and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Liverpool and Wigan Churches Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to.

Barrow-in-Furness Corporation Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

Torquay Tramways Bill. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Arbroath Corporation Water Order Confirmation Bill (No. 140); Dunfermline District Water Order Confirmation Bill (No. 141); Glasgow Corporation (Police) Order Confirmation Bill (No. 142). Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; to be printed; and pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899), deemed to have been read 2ª (The Lord Kintore (*E. Kintore*)), and reported from the Committee.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill (No. 143); Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill (No. 144). Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners.

Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Provisional Order Bill; Hamilton Gas Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.] House in Committee (according to order); Bills reported without Amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be read 3ª on Thursday next.

PETITIONS.

SUPPLY OF ELECTRICITY BILL [H.L.].

Petition to be heard by counsel against; of the County Council of Lanarkshire; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

INDIA (ACCOUNTS AND ESTIMATES, 1904–1905).

Explanatory memorandum by the Secretary of State for India.

FISHERIES (IRELAND).

Report of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland on the sea and coast fisheries of Ireland, for the year 1903. Part I. General Report.

REFORMATORY AND INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS (GREAT BRITAIN).

Forty-seventh Report, for the year 1903, of the Inspector of Reformatory and Industrial Schools. Part I. List of schools and detailed reports.

Presented [by Command], and ordered to lie on the Table.

PENAL SERVITUDE ACT, 1891.

Regulation made by the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland for taking finger-prints, etc., of untried prisoners.

SEA FISHERIES REGULATION ACT, 1888.

Order made by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries, under the provisions of the above Act, for the variation of the Order creating the North-Eastern Sea Fisheries District.

PRISONS (ENGLAND AND WALES) (VISITING COMMITTEES).

Draft rules proposed to be made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, under the Prison Acts, 1877 and 1898, with respect to the constitution of the Visiting Committee of Borstal Prison.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HALL-MARKING OF FOREIGN PLATE BILL.

Reported from the Standing Committee without Amendment; and to be read 3ª on Thursday next.

THE PROTECTION OF THE BRITISH FLAG.

LORD MUSKERRY: My Lords, I desire to put to the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs a Question of which I have already given him notice, namely, "What amount of protection is the British flag supposed to confer upon British subjects or others who are on board a ship flying the British flag?" I have put this Question because there is an idea—it may be an erroneous idea—that the officers of a foreign Power cannot arrest anyone on board a British ship and take him from under the British flag unless armed with a letter from either the British Minister or the British Consul authorising them to do so.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of LANSDOWNE): The noble Lord has put a Question to me in very general terms, and he will not be surprised if I reply in equally general language. The best information which I have been able to collect for him is to this effect, that, speaking generally, a British ship on the high seas is regarded as British territory. Persons on board, whether British or foreigners, are regarded as being on British territory, and have the same protection and rights as though they were actually on British territory.

REGISTRATION OF CLUBS (IRELAND) BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

*LORD CLONBROCK: My Lords, in asking your Lordships to read this Bill a second time it will not be necessary for me to take up your time with many remarks. A Bill of the same nature passed last year for Scotland, and the year before for this country, the object of all being to put an end to the so-called clubs which are really formed solely for drinking purposes. It has often happened that a man who has been refused a spirit licence, either on the ground of his career or the unsuitability of his premises, has promptly converted his premises into a club, with the result that there is established an unlicensed, irregular, and ill-conducted place of public entertainment. In order to prevent this state of things this Bill provides that all clubs shall be registered, that the registrar shall be the clerk of petty sessions, who shall enter the certificate of registration on this register, and that any application for registration shall be accompanied by a certificate signed by two magistrates of the district, and by two copies of all the rules of the club; also, notice must be given in a newspaper circulating in the district in which the application is made. These rules are set forth in Clause 4 of the Bill. I need not go through them beyond mentioning that they are practically identical with the rules in the Act relating to Scotland which was passed last year, with one exception, to which I attach some importance, and which I will mention in a moment.

Objections can be raised before the Court of petty sessions by the Constabulary or the Metropolitan Police in Dublin, or by anyone resident in the district, on grounds set forth in Clause 5, and the magistrates, after considering both the application and the objections, can either give or withhold the certificate. Again, in the case of a renewal, the same course takes place, the same objections can be made, and the magistrates will then decide whether the club has been properly conducted according to the rules, and will only renew the certificate on those conditions. This Bill has passed the House of Commons with the approval of all Parties—a happy state of things which does not usually obtain in regard to legislation connected with Ireland. I understand that His Majesty's Government propose to insert some Amendments, one of which is of considerable importance, but the others are more or less of a drafting character.

In the Bill, as it stands, there is an absolute prohibition of the sale of excisable liquor to any member of a club to be consumed off the premises. This is an unnecessarily stringent provision, and it is not in either the Scottish or the English Act. It interferes with the liberty of respectable members of a club who would, for instance, be prevented, when going for a day's fishing or for a day in the country, from taking any alcoholic liquor with them to be consumed, say, with their luncheon. The Amendment which is to be moved by His Majesty's Government has for its object the sanctioning of this sale to members within limited hours—that is, between the hour of eight o'clock in the morning and the hour of ten o'clock at night. I think that is a very reasonable Amendment, and one which ought to be accepted. Although I approve of the terms of the Amendment to be moved on behalf of His Majesty's Government, I intend to move one of my own, which I like better.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a."—(*Lord Clonbrock.*)

THE EARL OF DENBIGH: My Lords, I have only to say, on behalf of the Irish Government, that there is no objection to this Bill. I shall, however, have a few Amendments, many of a merely drafting character, to move besides the one referred to by the noble Lord.

On Question, Bill read 2^a, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Friday next.

CROWN AGENTS AND SHIPPING RATES.

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH rose to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies the following Questions:—I. Is it the fact that one of the Crown Agents is a director of the London Assurance Company, and is such appointment in accordance with the regulations of the Civil Service; and why are not the Crown Agents paid a fixed salary like other members of the Civil Service sufficient to preclude their receiving any other emoluments? II. (1) Is the Under-Secretary for the Colonies aware that the British India Steam Navigation Company has recently joined what is known as the "Shipping Ring," namely, that association of shipping firms carrying goods to South Africa which has agreed to maintain a high rate of transport for freights? (2) Is the Under-Secretary aware that at the present time freights between England and South Africa have been raised to about 38s. a ton, whereas from New York to South Africa they are only 12s. a ton? (3) Is the Under-Secretary aware that the result of this raising of the freights levied by all British shipping firms trading with South Africa is such as to cause increased orders for goods to be placed in New York and in other parts of the United States of America, in order to take advantage of the low freight (12s. a ton) from American ports to South Africa, while something of the same kind takes place with regard to Belgium and Western Germany in connection with the transport from Hamburg? (4) Will the Under-Secretary state the arrangements which have been made by the Crown Agents in connection with the shipping of Government goods to South Africa during the last six months, giving the names of the firms employed and the rate of freight agreed upon?

He said: My Lords, in putting the Questions standing in my name on the Paper, I must apologise for their length, but my remarks upon them will be very short. As regards the first Question, the information which I am particularly anxious to elicit is whether or not the Crown Agents are considered a department of the Colonial Office, and whether they therefore come under the regulations and conditions of the Civil Service. If it is true that the Crown Agents are permitted to hold other posts, which I am informed is the case, it is hardly fair that that prohibition should apply to other civil servants, like those connected with the Foreign Office. This is not the occasion, nor the time, to consider the propriety or impropriety of the existing regulations concerning the Civil Service; but I wish to point out, with regard to this directorship of the London Assurance Company, that this company does, so I am informed, do the chief, if not the whole, of the insurance business of the Crown Agents' department. It would appear to me that in the interests of the public service, and in the interests of sound administration, the insurance business of the Crown Agents should be put up to tender, and should be tendered for by a certain number of the first-class insurance agencies. It is not, in itself, satisfactory that a Crown Agent should be a director of any particular insurance company.

With regard to the question of the rates of freight between this country and South Africa as compared with the freights from New York to South Africa, I may mention that while in some cases the freights between England and South Africa have been raised to about 38s. a ton, the latest information which I have received is that the average rate of freight by the Conference Lines—that is, the shipping ring—is at the present moment 30s. a ton to South African ports from Great Britain, as compared with 12s. a ton from New York to South Africa. I should like to make this other statement in connection with the question of the shipping ring, that I am informed that this ring, which consists almost entirely of British firms, has established, and is now maintaining, a fleet of steamers running between New York and South African ports to carry American manufactures at less than one-half the rate of freight charged from British ports. I beg to put the Questions standing in my name.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The Duke of MARLBOROUGH): My Lords, the noble Earl has been very considerate in not departing from the Questions he has put down on the Paper and pursuing other matters of Colonial administration which I admit on a previous occasion he could not help following. He has on the present occasion confined himself entirely to the Questions on the Paper, and I am sure the noble Earl would wish that I should reply to them more or less categorically. He asks me, in the first place, whether it is the fact that one of the Crown Agents is a director of the London Assurance Company. The answer to that is in the affirmative. Then the noble Earl is anxious to know whether such appointment is in accordance with the regulations of the Civil Service. I must explain to the noble Earl that the Crown Agents, technically, are not Civil servants; but I will not press that point to the extent of giving the reasons why. I am in perfect agreement with him that it is unusual—in fact, I do not think it is possible—for members of the Civil Service to hold directorships.

Then the noble Earl wishes to know whether the Crown Agents are paid a fixed salary. I think I told him when we last debated this question that their salaries were fixed, and could only be altered at the wish, or with the sanction, of the Secretary of State. The fact that one of the Crown Agents (Sir Ernest Blake) holds a directorship is somewhat exceptional. I do not think I need go into the reasons why Sir Ernest Blake holds this appointment. He has conducted his work as a Crown Agent in a most admirable and proper manner, and I do not think the fact that he has been a director of this assurance company has been detrimental in any way to the public service over which he presides. The noble Earl is no doubt aware that this matter has already been brought up in another place, and the Secretary of State, in reply, said he would consider the question. I can assure the noble Earl that the Crown Agent in question has put himself entirely in the hands of the Secretary of State, who is considering this question and will give his decision when the Colonial Office Vote is taken in the House of Commons. In view of the fact that the Colonial Office Vote must be taken at a date not very far distant, and in view, moreover, of the fact that this is a somewhat personal matter, involving the private affairs of a public servant who is under the authority of the Secretary of State, I hope the noble Earl will take my assurance that the matter is being considered, and will agree with me that it would be better and more appropriate that the announcement of the Secretary of State's decision should be given by the Secretary of State himself.

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: I quite agree with the noble Duke on that point.

*THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH: The noble Earl next asks me whether I am aware that the British India Steam Navigation Company has recently joined what is known as the shipping ring. Yes, I can assure the noble Earl that we are perfectly aware of that fact. The other day the noble Earl below the Gangway (Earl Grey) deplored the fact that the Colonial Office had not employed this line, and he called it the "one solitary independent line." We were perfectly aware of the fact that the British India Steam Navigation Company had close commercial relations with the Conference Lines. There is an agreement with the Conference Lines to this effect, that the British India Steam Navigation Company will not deliver any goods from this country to any of the South African ports, except Beira and Delagoa Bay, and I am informed, moreover, that even with regard to these ports the rates are not competitive. It is, therefore, perfectly clear that they are not an independent line. There is no real competition between this country and South Africa, and it would be impossible for us to regard the British India Steam Navigation Company as an independent line, or to contemplate treating them as such as long as they have this agreement with the Conference Lines.

EARL GREY: Can the noble Duke inform the House of the date of the agreement between the British India Steam Navigation Company and the Conference ring?

*THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH: I am afraid I cannot give the noble Lord the exact date. I rather think it was about twelve months ago; and subsequent to that agreement they made a second one, so I am informed, to the effect that the rates even to Delagoa Bay and Beira are no longer free and independent rates. They have come to a definite understanding with the Conference ring as to what those rates should be. Therefore, I think the noble Earl will admit that the British India Company is not an independent line, but is closely associated with the Conference. The noble Earl who placed these Questions on the Paper next asks whether I am aware that at the present time freights between England and South Africa have been raised, and are higher than the rates between America and South Africa. It is very difficult to form an accurate opinion, because it is so hard to make an accurate comparison. In the first place, we require the whole of the American tariff and the whole of the English tariff, and then it is not a question of average. Three or four different tables or classes are laid down. There are first, second, third, and fourth classes, and goods are classified under these different heads. For instance, rails would be under the lowest class of all—the cheapest class, whilst small parcels of breakable goods would probably come under the most expensive class, so that unless you have before you the different rates and can ascertain to which schedule a particular article belongs, I submit it is most difficult to make an accurate and proper comparison.

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: It is quite true that there are different rates according to different scales, but my point is this, that I have found out that the average difference between the rates from this country and from America bears this enormous disproportion.

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH: The noble Earl may be correct in his average. I am quite unable to say, for I do not know how it is arrived at. It is most difficult and complicated. In addition, you have to take into consideration the cost of landing, lighterage, and sorting, which the shippers have to do. Although I will not challenge the statement of the noble Earl that the American rates are lower than the English rates, yet I do submit that it is most difficult to ascertain the difference between the two rates, because there are so many complicated items which have to be considered. I do not think the noble Earl is correct in saying that the freights from New York to South Africa are only 12s. a ton. My information is that they vary from 15s. to 17s. 6d. a ton, and I believe I am right in saying that the lowest public rate between this country and South Africa is about 25s. a ton, so the noble Earl will see that the difference between 17s. 6d. and 25s., though I admit it is considerable, is somewhat less than that which he has quoted to your Lordships.

Then the noble Earl suggests that the result of this raising of freights levied by British shipping firms upon trade between this country and South Africa is to increase the trade between America and South Africa. It may be that the trade between America and South Africa is increasing. No doubt the noble Earl has evidence to support that view, but I do not know that it has increased quite to the extent that he seems to infer. Americans are extremely clever traders, and many articles may be required in South Africa which cannot be obtained in this country, and unless the noble Earl can show me that the trade between America and South Africa in goods similar to those which can be sent from this country has increased, I do not think there is very much to complain of. We cannot object, for instance, to large consignments of grain going from America to the Cape, and if very low freights are quoted, it is clear that the Americans will get the control, or, at any rate, the largest order in that particular commodity.

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: Will the noble Duke give us the comparative volume of trade between the two countries and South Africa in the last few months?

*THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH: I am afraid I cannot give that, but I know, with regard to the total South African trade, that at present we possess two-thirds and that one-third is enjoyed by America and other countries. As to the low rates which the noble Earl has quoted, can he assure me that the American shippers are making a profit? I am informed that they are losing a considerable amount of money in quoting these low freights, and that they have only done so in order to try and undercut the English trade and eventually get a monopoly. I think it is reasonable to suppose that they will not succeed in their design. The result will be that these low freights, which I do not deny may now exist, will not be at all permanent. I anticipate seeing in a few months, perhaps a year, the 17s. 6d. increased to a higher figure. I cannot quite agree with the statement which the noble Earl makes at the end of his Question, that something of the same kind takes place with regard to Belgium and Western Germany in connection with the transport from Hamburg. My information is that the German lines all belong to the Conference, and that the rate of freight on the sea is uniform, and is the same from Germany to South Africa as it is from this country. But the reason why the Germans are able to send their goods to South Africa cheaper than we can is this—that the German State railways grant a preferential rate to manufactured goods from the places of manufacture to the port where they are shipped, and consequently, as they gain an advantage on the railway rates, they can naturally quote in South Africa through rates which are more favourable than those which British shipowners can offer, and no doubt that is the explanation why the Germans are pushing forward their trade in South Africa at the present moment.

The noble Earl was anxious to know what arrangements have been made by the Crown Agents in connection with the shipping of Government goods to South Africa. I cannot give the noble Earl a full statement of the contract which the Crown Agents have made with the Conference lines. It is a very long and complicated document, and I feel sure that the noble Earl would not wish me to occupy the time of the House in presenting it. Moreover, I do not think it would be altogether in the interests of the public service that it should be published in its entirety. I suppose the noble Earl wants to know roughly what agreement has been made in order that he can compare it with the public rates, or assure himself that the Crown Agents have made proper and reasonable terms on behalf of the Colonial Office. We believe that the arrangement which the Crown Agents have made with the Conference lines for the shipment of goods from this country is a reasonable and a good arrangement, and one which compares very favourably with those made in previous years. To give the noble Earl an instance, I may mention that 30,000 tons of rails are to be shipped this year to South African ports at a uniform rate of 16s. per ton. For a somewhat smaller consignment of rails the price is higher, namely, 18s. 6d. a ton. Then arrangements have been made to ship locomotives and building material at 20s. a ton; but the noble Earl will understand that in addition there are, of course, lighterage, sorting, and other charges to be added, these being charges which the Conference lines, and indeed, all shipping lines, make to the public or to the Government.

The noble Earl asked me to state the names of the firms employed. I presume he means by that the names of the companies in the Conference lines. The names as are follow: The Union Castle Mail Steamship Co., The Clan Line of Steamers, the Bucknall Steamship Line, Ballard, King & Co., John T. Rennie & Co., the Ellerman Harrison Line, and R. P. Houston & Co. With regard to the general question, I do not know whether the noble Earl, in asking for this information, was inclined to consider that this question of freights was directly connected with the business of the Crown Agents. I hope he will not assume that because he can show that the freights between America and the Cape are lower than those between this country and the Cape that has anything to do with the efficiency of the administration of the Crown Agents. All that they are concerned to do is to carry out the orders they receive from the Colonial Office, and we believe that the agreement they have made on behalf of the Colonial Office for the shipment of goods from this country to South Africa is not only a good agreement but one which will give satisfaction to the Governments of the Transvaal and of the Orange River Colony.

As to the question of getting a better rate for the public, that is entirely outside the province of the Crown Agents. It is a matter which the Government alone could undertake or examine, and it is very doubtful whether it would be wise for the Government to do so. The noble Earl may have read the Report of a Committee of the House of Commons, presided over by Mr. Evelyn Cecil, which went very carefully into the question whether it would be wise for the Government to grant subsidies to any particular steamship lines for the purpose of encouraging trade in any part of the world. They unanimously came to the conclusion that it would be unwise for the Government to do so, and, furthermore, they pointed out that in the case of Continental Powers that had given these subsidies, they did not think their action had been advantageous. I know that the noble Earl is solicitous for the welfare of persons trading between this country and South Africa, a feeling which I myself share, and he may be interested to know that the various Governments in South Africa propose sending representatives to a conference which is to take place in South Africa to discuss this question of the rate of freights. Until we know what the result of that conference is, until we are informed of the wishes and views of the people of South Africa themselves upon this subject, it would be premature for His Majesty's Government to offer any opinion upon such a difficult and complicated matter.

EARL GREY: My Lords, I desire to conform in every way to the rules of debate in your Lordships' House, but really the noble Duke makes it extremely difficult for me to do so. He was asked certain Questions on matters of fact, but in replying to those Questions he has delivered a speech brimming over with controversial matter and matter of opinion. There is no Motion before the House, and I am conscious that I am debarred by the rules which govern debates here from making a speech in answer to the observations which we have just listened to from the noble Duke, but, with the permission of the House, I will briefly refer to one of the points in the noble Duke's speech. The noble Duke has twitted me with having misinformed the House on the last occasion when this question was under debate, and with having told your Lordships that the British India Steamship Company was an independent line of steamers so far as Delagoa Bay was concerned. It is true that I made the statement that at that time the company was, as I believed, an independent line to Delagoa Bay. Of course, I was aware that there was an arrangement between that company and the Conference lines with regard to the South African ports, but that arrangement left Delagoa Bay an open field for competition between the British India Steamship Company and the Conference lines.

I asked His Majesty's Government whether they would support this independent line to Delagoa Bay, the owners of which were more anxious to get a share of the freight consigned to that port than to obtain a subsidy from the Government. The extraordinary answer I received from Lord Onslow was—"How can His Majesty's Government even consider the expediency of shipping freight to Delagoa Bay by a steamship company that does not want to stop at Cape Town or Port Elizabeth"? I did think that was trifling with the business capacity of this House. Delagoa Bay was a port at which the British India Steamship Company, certainly at the beginning of this session, was perfectly entitled to compete with the Conference lines. I want to know whether His Majesty's Government ever gave them an opportunity of tendering for a single ton of cargo to Delagoa Bay. I also want to know whether His Majesty's Government ever gave an opportunity of tendering for a single ton of cargo to Messrs. Houston & Company when that was an independent line. It is my belief that it is the action of the Government in refusing to support the independent lines which has forced those lines one after the other into the Conference ring. I warned your Lordships in the last debate that if you pursued this policy of only feeding the Conference lines and did not follow the example of the Indian Government in supporting the independent lines, you would force the British India Steamship Company in its turn into the Conference ring. There is a great deal more to be said in answer to the noble Duke, but as we shall, no doubt, have another opportunity of discussing the points raised, I will not longer detain your Lordships now.

EDUCATION GRANTS.

EARL BATHURST, who had a Question on the Paper to the following effect: "To ask the President of the Board of Education whether the Board of Education are aware that by the proposed change in the system of grants as announced in Article 31 of the Code for 1904, that on fourteen typical schools, six being town schools of sixteen departments, and eight country schools under the Gloucestershire Education Authority, having 5,049 children on their books, the loss in grant on that number will be £125 19s., or 5.98d. per scholar, and that, if, as it seems reasonable to expect, this result will follow throughout the county, the loss on an average attendance of 48,000 will be £1,196 per annum,"—said: My Lords, I feel that I owe some apology to your Lordships for the length of time this Question has appeared on the Paper in my name. Although it has lain there almost dormant I think it has had a very good effect, for I have been informed that the new Code of grants has already been entirely withdrawn. This Question, therefore, comes before your Lordships rather late in the day. It was my intention, in asking it, to bring to your Lordships' notice the loss that would be entailed on local education authorities by this new scheme, and to ask the Board of Education whether they would postpone its coming into effect for a year, or at least until such time as the local education authorities had been able to consult with one another and with the Board of Education, so that a thoroughly satisfactory Code might be drawn up with full knowledge of what its effect would be. As the Code is now withdrawn, it will be unnecessary for me to enter into any of the figures, of which I have a good many with me, the object of my Question having been achieved. I have, however, brought this subject to your Lordships' notice today, as the noble Marquess the President of the Board of Education very courteously said he was willing to make a statement on the question which, no doubt, will interest many of your Lordships who take an active part in the work of county councils. I beg, in conclusion, to thank the noble Marquess for the consideration he has shown me in making the desired inquiries, and also for withdrawing the Code.

THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL AND PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (The Marquess of LONDONDERRY): My Lords, my noble friend has been kind enough to thank me for what he calls the courtesy shown to him. I feel, if I may say so, that the boot is on the other leg. It is I who owe him a debt of gratitude for the considerate manner in which from time to time he has postponed this Question, which, as he has told your Lordships, has been on the Paper for some time. I was very anxious to go fully into this question of the scale of grants before giving my noble friend what I hoped would be an answer of a satisfactory character. As my noble friend has told your Lordships, the scale of grants which we inserted in the Code has now been withdrawn, and I do not, therefore, think it necessary to go at any length into the question of what might or might not have been the result of that scale had it been continued.

While I do not propose to give your Lordships a long dissertation on the reasons why we inserted this scale of grants in the Code, it may not be out of place if, in a very few words, I place before you our object in introducing it and our reason for withdrawing it. The Board of Education introduced the scale of grants in question in order to complete those changes in the methods of distributing the grant to public elementary schools which were initiated by the block grant established in 1900, which has been operative since 31st March, 1901. We proposed that the scale of grants should be—15s. average attendance for children under five years of age; 20s. average attendance from five to twelve years of age; and 25s. average attendance over twelve years of age; as against what had been the previous grant of 17s. for infants and 22s. for older scholars.

We considered that in framing this scale we were assisting the classification of children for instruction, and producing, to a certain extent, greater independence of financial considerations. We also considered that with this change it would be possible for inspectors the better to advise us as to improvements. We certainly thought that a higher rate should be paid for scholars who remained at school a year after twelve than should be paid in respect of a year before five. I think your Lordships will acknowledge that the reason for that is a sound one, inasmuch as it is possible for children over twelve years of age to obtain the practical advantages of education to a greater extent in proportion than children under the age of five. We had hoped that this alteration in the scale of grants, this increase in that direction, would have proved an attraction which would have been taken advantage of.

I do not for a moment controvert what my noble friend stated with regard to there being losses in some districts and gains in others. In the Question on the Paper the noble Earl goes very closely into the figures and the manner in which his own native county, Gloucestershire, would be affected. Not being prepared to argue this point, inasmuch as the scale has now been withdrawn, I have not gone very carefully into the figures submitted, but I cannot help thinking that if we had gone very closely into those figures we might have found that the state of affairs was not quite so black as my noble friend has painted them. We fully recognised that there would have been losses in some districts, but we had hoped that the gains in others might have been the means of counterbalancing the losses, and that the authorities in those districts would have seen their way for a time to endure the small losses in order to gain the greater benefits which we believed would accrue. But experience has shown that this was not the case, and as we fully recognised that there was considerable opposition in certain districts we did not think we were justified in retaining those clauses in the Code. I do not for one moment admit that we were wrong in inserting them in the first instance. Although we felt bound to withdraw the scale in view of the hardship some districts believed that they would suffer, we still firmly believe in its principle, and I hope that those districts will, in course of time, come to see the advantages of the system.

THE CASE OF CONSTABLE ANDERSON.

EARL CADOGAN: My Lords, I rise to ask His Majesty's Government whether they will lay on the Table of the House all official Papers and correspondence connected with the case of Constable Anderson, of the Royal Irish Constabulary. When I gave notice of this Question yesterday, I was careful to explain to the House that it was not my intention to raise a discussion, at all events on this occasion, upon the subject to which it refers. The case of Constable Anderson is one of a peculiar character, and has aroused an immense amount of feeling throughout the country. It has formed the subject of many writings in newspapers and elsewhere, and it has also, I think, caused some disturbance of mind to those who, like your Lordships, are anxious that nothing should be done to exacerbate the feelings between the various religious sects in Ireland. I am not aware of exactly how much information we have before us on this case. I believe that in the shape of Answers to Questions in another place the Chief Secretary has given certain information to the Members of the other House, and I believe also that the particulars of the trial of Constable Anderson are to be obtained, though I confess I have not been able to see them. I venture to put it to your Lordships that if this case is to be considered in this House—and I think it is almost impossible that it should not be raised in some form or other—it would be desirable, not only for our sakes, but for the sake of His Majesty's Government, that all the information that can be conveniently given should be afforded to the House. I am not aware whether the subject will be raised in another place, though I have heard that such is the expectation; but whether that is so or not, I venture to ask His Majesty's Government whether they will lay upon the Table any—I should prefer to say all—official communications which have passed on this subject. I do so with a desire that if the subject is discussed it should be discussed with full and perfect information, which we have certainly not got at present. I should be glad if His Majesty's Government would return a favourable Answer to my Question.

*THE LORD CHANCELLOR OF IRELAND (Lord ASHBOURNE): My Lords, any request coming from the noble Earl, who has had so long and so distinguished a connection with the Government of Ireland would, of course, meet with a most ready and cordial response from those who are at present responsible for the Executive administration of that country; but I am informed that there are no documents which they can, in accordance with practice and convenience, lay on the Table of your Lordships' House. But when my noble friend desires to discuss the subject in detail he will find any materials that he may require in the very numerous Questions and Answers in the other House of

Parliament. Though I have not myself seen it, there is also, I believe, a report of the evidence that was taken at the inquiry.

EARL CADOGAN: Which inquiry.

*LORD ASHBOURNE: At the second Court of Inquiry, at which sworn evidence was taken. I am told that it appeared in the Press, and, if so, it is accessible to everyone who desires to see it. I am not in a position to meet my noble friend further; but whenever he deems it right to raise the question, it will, of course, be my duty to be here and to give such explanation as may be desirable.

EARL SPENCER: My Lords, I fully share the views of the noble Earl opposite —that it is extremely difficult to deal with this subject without more information than apparently we now have. The noble and learned Lord, the Lord Chancellor of Ireland, replied that there is, so far as he knows, sufficient information in Answers to Questions in another place. My noble friend the late Lord-Lieutenant certainly did not seem to think that information sufficient, and then the noble and learned Lord said it was not usual to produce Papers such as those asked for. Every case of this kind must be decided upon its merits, and if this case is one of very great importance, as apparently it is, I think an exception to the usual practice should be made, and if there are any Papers and documents which bear materially upon it I would press His Majesty's Government to produce them. I am told that the Irish newspapers have been full of this case for some time past; and from the leading organs here we know that there is a good deal of feeling on the subject, and that it is a question of some importance. I would, therefore, ask the noble and learned Lord whether in this case he cannot see his way to produce other documents than the one which he says is available bearing materially on this case and putting it properly before the public.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of LANSDOWNE): My Lords, I am sure nothing is further from the desire of the Irish Government than to suppress any information which can properly be given to the public, and it occurs to me that matters would be rather advanced if the noble Earl would give us an idea of the kind of documents which he thinks might be produced. One important document has been referred to by the noble and learned Lord—namely, that containing the finding of the Court of Inquiry.

EARL CADOGAN: The evidence.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: The evidence of the Court of Inquiry, and, I imagine, the orders passed upon it by the Lord-Lieutenant. I understand that these documents are already public property. If the noble Earl will tell us what other Papers he would desire to possess we will certainly consider his demand for their production.

EARL SPENCER: I can only speak from past experience in these matters. I have myself held the position of Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, and, so far as I know, there must have been minutes on this subject—minutes by the Inspector-General of Constabulary, minutes regulating the Court of Inquiry, and minutes which would show how the final decision took place. I understand that there have been several decisions on the point, and there must be Papers on which the final decision, which is, I understand, to reinstate this constable, was based. I am not expressing any shadow of opinion one way or the other; but, in a case of this sort, where there is strong feeling and a great desire to get at the bottom of the matter, I think more official documents than those to which reference has been made ought to be produced.

LORD ASHBOURNE: I will mention the matter to the Chief Secretary, in whose competence it is, and ascertain if there are any documents which, in his opinion, can, in the interests of the public service, be laid on the Table.

EARL CADOGAN: It was because I did not in any way wish to embarrass His Majesty's Government that I did not mention any particular document which I wished produced. I should be quite content if His Majesty's Government would agree to afford us any information they can, and lay on the Table of the House such documents as they think can be laid without any injury to the public service.

House adjourned at half-past Five o'clock, to Thursday next, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 12th July, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS [LORDS (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).

MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.:—Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time to-morrow.

Doncaster Corporation Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Richard Jaeger's Patent Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Caledonian Railway Order Confirmation Bill [Lords]; Glasgow and South Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill [Lords]; Govan Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [Lords]. Read a second time; to be considered upon Thursday.

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 3) Bill [Lords]; Scotch Education Department Provisional Order Confirmation (Edinburgh) Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed.

Great Western Railway Bill [Lords]; Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynaman Railway Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP No. 10).

Sir Lewis McIver reported from the Committee on Group No. 10 of Railway Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, they had adjourned until Tuesday next, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Education Board Provisional Order (Cardiff) Bill; City of London (Central Criminal Court-House) Bill, without Amendment.

Charing Cross, Euston, and Hampstead Railway Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to—Southport and Lytham Tramroad (Extension of Time) Bill [Lords]; Filey Improvement Bill [Lords]; Maidenhead Bridge Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

PETITIONS.

BISHOPRICS OF SOUTHWARK AND BIRMINGHAM BILL.

Petition from Birmingham, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Kintyre, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; from Allestree; Armley; Aston on Trent; Barrow on Soar; Borrowash; Boughton; Boxted; Bradford; Bramley; Brierfield; Bucknall; Callow; Camberwell; Castle Donington; Colby; Colne (two); Costock; Derby; Dewsbury (two); Dunstan; East Leake; Elmstead; Foubridge; Gateshead (four); Great Bedwyn; Hackney; Haltwhistle; Hastings; Hebburn; Helpringham; Hemingfield; Hexham; Hither Green; Holbeck (two); Heton; Ilford; Kilburn; King's Heath; Leysters; Loughborough; Low Wortley; Madeley; Mark's Tey; Mawbrey; Mount Sorrel; Newcastle on Tyne (three); New Wortley; Norwich; Peldon; Pewsey; Preston; Quarndon; Queen's Ferry; Rocksholme; Sabden; Silver Royd Hill; South Bank; Stamford Hill; Thornton; Warrington; West Mersea; Willoughby; Wimborne; Wivenhoe; Wymeswold; and York; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Hastings; and South Kensington; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES' OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION BILL.

Petition from Camberwell, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

VALUATION BILL.

Petitition from Nuneaton, against; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

REFORMATORY AND INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS (GREAT BRITAIN).

Copy presented, of Forty-seventh Report of His Majesty's Inspector of Reformatory and Industrial Schools for 1903. Part I. List of Schools and Detailed Reports [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PRISONS (ENGLAND AND WALES).

Copy presented, of Draft Rules proposed to be made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department under the Prisons Acts, 1877 and 1898, with respect to the constitution of the Visiting Committee of Borstal Prison [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

PENAL SERVITUDE ACT, 1891.

Copy presented, of Regulations made by the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland for taking Finger Prints, etc., of Untried Prisoners [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

EAST INDIA (ACCOUNTS AND ESTIMATES, 1904–5).

Copy presented, of Explanatory Memorandum by the Secretary of State for India [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SEA FISHERIES REGULATION ACT, 1888.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries, under the provisions of the Act for the variation of the Order creating the North Eastern Sea Fisheries District [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports Annual Series, Nos. 3213 to 3215 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRAMWAYS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 2) BILL.

Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Order included in the Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill."—(*Mr. Bonar Law.*)

ELECTRIC POWER UNDERTAKINGS.

Return ordered, "showing the names of companies or persons who have obtained Acts conveying powers for the supply of Electric Power to Districts, with the names and areas of such Districts and the year in which the powers were obtained, and whether such powers have been exercised or not; and, in the former case, what is the state of the Works constructed under such powers."—(*Mr. Gerald Balfour.*)

PROSECUTION OF OFFENCES ACTS, 1879 AND 1884.

Address for "Return showing the working of the Regulations made in 1886 for carrying out the Prosecution of Offences Acts, 1879 and 1884, with Statistics setting forth the number, nature, result, and cost of the Proceedings instituted by the Director, in accordance with those Regulations, from the 1st day of January, 1903, to the 31st day of December, 1903 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 209, of Session 1903)."—(*Mr. Cochrane.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Religious Examinations in Schools—Permission of the Local Authority.

MR. SOAMES (Norfolk, S.): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether he is aware that the ordinary work of the national school at Wortwell, Norfolk, was suspended on Friday, 24th June, for an examination in religious knowledge, by the diocesan inspector, without leave from the local authority; and, if so, whether he will give instructions that the permission of the local authority must in future be obtained before the school work is interrupted for this purpose.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) I have no information as to the particular case referred to in the Question. This matter is governed by Section 76 of The Elementary Education Act, 1870, under which managers are entitled to fix a day or days, not more than two in number, for the inspection or examination of the school by the diocesan inspector. The notice which the section requires is to be given in the school. The section says nothing of notice to the local authority; though under the changed conditions of the Act of 1902 it would certainly appear to be desirable, as a matter of courtesy and convenience, that such notice should be given.

Obstruction of Main Street in Omagh by Farming Machines.

DR. THOMPSON (Monaghan, N.): To ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland if he is aware of the obstruction to traffic in the main street of the town of Omagh caused by the exhibition of dangerous and unprotected farming machines and implements; is he aware that the street is blocked to a distance of fifteen feet from the pathway with these implements; and, if so, will he explain why, although frequent complaints have been made to the police, this public danger not only remains unabated but is daily growing more serious.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) The Towns Improvement Act of 1854 has been adopted in Omagh, and offences of the character mentioned are prosecuted by the town commissioners. The police have reported all cases of obstruction of the thoroughfares to the commissioners, but the latter have declined to institute proceedings. I am considering the question of directing the police, under the circumstances, to take proceedings under the 92nd Section of the Act.

Outstanding Exchequer Bonds and Treasury Bills.

MR. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, what is the amount at present outstanding of Exchequer Bonds and Treasury Bills respectively.

(*Answered by Mr Austen Chamberlain.*)

Outstanding on 12th July, 1904.

	£
Exchequer Bonds . .	20,500,000
Treasury Bills . . .	26,633,000*
	47,133,000

* N.B.—£5,500,000 of these Bills are advances on Ways and Means, and must be paid off within the financial year.

State of Affairs in the Aden Hinterland.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has received any information as to the state of affairs in the Aden *Hinterland* which would account for the despatch of an increased military force from Aden.

(*Answered by Mr Secretary Brodrick.*) In consequence of a threatened attack by the Kotaibi on our post at Sulek, which is about fifty-five miles from Aden on the route northwards, the Resident, as a precautionary measure, strengthened the post and the communications between it and Aden. These measures, according to a report received by telegraph on the 10th instant, seem to have had the desired effect.

Members of Royal Irish Constabulary Punished at Instance of County Inspector Ball.

MR. P. A. McHUGH (Leitrim, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can give the number of sergeants and constables of the Royal Irish Constabulary punished at the instance of County Inspector Ball since his appointment to county Leitrim.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) Two sergeants were punished at the instance of the county inspector since the date referred to, January, 1902. Two constables were also fined by him in the same period on reports made by their officers.

Sanitary Condition of Irish Workhouses.

DR. THOMPSON: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware of the state of dirt and neglect to which the poor of Irish workhouses are exposed; that in many of these institutions there are no baths, water-closets, water supply, or other sanitary conveniences; and whether, seeing that these institutions are inspected by non-professional inspectors, without any scientific attainments or special knowledge, he will direct that in future these institutions, and especially the hospitals, shall be inspected by medical and not lay inspectors.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The poor in Irish workhouses are not in a state of dirt and neglect. They are much cleaner and are better cared for than the poor outside the workhouses. If, however, the hon. Member will refer me to any workhouse in which it is suggested that the contrary is the case I shall be pleased to cause an investigation to be made. The workhouses are visited periodically by experienced lay inspectors, and I am not aware that they discharge their duty less efficiently because they have no scientific attainments. The workhouse hospitals are inspected by two medical inspectors specially appointed for the purpose.

Sanitary Condition of Glenties Workhouse.

DR. THOMPSON: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that in the Glenties Workhouse there is no water supply; that there are no baths or water-closets, or means of heating water, and that notwithstanding the frequent application of the authorities of the hospital and workhouse, these necessaries remain unsupplied; and, if so, will he direct the Local Government Board to insist on the immediate remedy of the grievances.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The water supply in this workhouse is defective. Basins and portable baths are, however, provided in the hospital. The

Local Government Board inspector has repeatedly called attention to the necessity for a sufficient water supply, and the board of guardians some time ago obtained plans for the work as well as for water-closets and bathroom accommodation; but, in view of the poverty and high rates in the district, the guardians decided to await the Report of the Poor Law Reform Commission before incurring the heavy expense of a better water supply.

Pensions for Junior Literary Assistants of the Irish National Education Commissioners.

MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.) To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland the number of junior literary assistants at present engaged by the Commissioners of National Education and National Schools of Ireland; and whether, considering the long service at low salaries rendered to the Commissioners by junior literary assistants, the Government will consider the advisability of allowing them pensions or compensation when they are unfit for work, the same as now applies in the case of national teachers.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The number of junior literary assistants in the service of the Commissioners is eleven. Teachers of this class are entitled to retiring gratuities under the old arrangements which were applicable to all teachers before the introduction of the Teachers' Pension Act. They are not eligible for pensions under the Teachers' Pension Act. This class of teacher is fast dying out and no new appointments are made.

Assistant Teachers in Irish National Schools.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.) To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what is the number of assistant teachers employed in Irish national schools; how many of those have been trained; what is the highest grade and salary they can reach as assistants; how many years must elapse under most favourably circumstances before they can reach the maximum; why it is that the spirit of the recent rules, which gives promotion and increase of salary to all others, is denied only to the assistants; whether, under those circumstances, steps will be taken to enable assistants of ten years service and classed under old rules as second-class to be promoted to second grade.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The number of assistant teachers employed in the year 1903 was 3,787, of whom 1,590 were trained. Assistants, as a rule, can only rank in the third grade, but may, under exceptional circumstances and by special order of the Board, be promoted above third grade (Rule 195f). So long as assistants are in the third grade, the maximum salary for men is £86 per annum, and for women £72 10s. per annum, in both cases exclusive of capitation fees, out of the school grant under the Irish Education Act of 1902. An assistant entering the service at the minimum salary would reach the maximum of the third grade under ordinary circumstances, if his service was good, in nine years. Under special and exceptional circumstances he might reach the maximum of the third grade, or even of a higher grade, in a much shorter time, but there is no fixed time limit. The new rules provide for increases of salary to assistants under ordinary circumstances, and for promotions of assistants under exceptional circumstances, but it was never contemplated, and it would not be desirable, to give assistants the same rights as principals in regard to promotion. The Commissioners desire that principals should, as a rule, be recruited from experienced assistants, but few assistants would be willing to take principalships with the corresponding increased responsibilites if they could, from the monetary point of view, do as well by remaining assistants. In reply to the concluding inquiry, I have nothing to add to my reply to the hon. Member's previous Question of the 29th of June† on the same subject.

Whisky for Inmates of the Naas Union — Refund of Duty.

MR. LEAMY (Kildare, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that the quarter cask of whisky, containing about 62 gallons, which had been procured by the guardians of the Naas Union for the use of the inmates, has become not potable owing to having been reduced by water which was subsequently found to have been polluted, and that the Local Government Board has ordered it to be destroyed; and, if so, whether, seeing that the duty has been paid on it, the Commissioners of Inland Revenue will either refund the duty or make some allowance in respect thereof, seeing that the guardians were at the loss of the material and have had to replace it.

---

† See page 27.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The facts are as stated. The workhouse master who was responsible for the loss has since been required to resign. The guardians communicated with the Commissioners of Inland Revenue, and were informed that the latter have no power to make any repayment of duty in respect of spirits which have passed out of Revenue control.

Gold Output of Transvaal Mines—White and Native Labour.

Dr. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can state the value of the gold output in the Transvaal mines for June, 1904, together with the white and native labour employed in the mining industry during the same month; whether he can state further the same facts for each month of 1904; and whether he can give the same facts for each of the periods of six months, as follows: July to December, 1901, January to June, 1902, July to December, 1902, January to June, 1903, July to December, 1903, and January to June, 1904.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) The following are the figures I am able to give:—

Transvaal Gold Mines.

	Value of Output.	Number of coloured (Natives) at work.	Number of white men at work.
	£		
June, 1904 . . .	1,309,231	68,857	Not available.
January, 1904 . .	1,231,418	69,159	12,814
February, 1904 . .	1,234,927	72,177	12,801
March, 1904. . .	1,310,567	73,667	12,681
April, 1904. . .	1,305,431	73,246	12,740
May, 1904. . .	1,335,826	70,778	Not available.

	Value of Output.	Average number of coloured (Natives) at work.	Average number of whites at work.
	£		
July to December, 1901 .	899,402	13,248	2,552
January to June, 1902 .	2,827,385	24,527	5,627
July to December, 1902 .	4,456,279	35,264	9,337
January to June, 1903 .	5,587,510	52,487	11,233
July to December, 1903 .	7,040,547	64,162	12,401
January to June, 1904 .	7,727,400	72,062 (average for January to April)	12,758 (average for January to April)

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Maltese Finance.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in view of the fact that three months have elapsed since the close of the financial year in Malta, he will undertake that a copy of the balance-sheet for the year will be available for Members of the House before the Vote on the Colonial Estimates is taken.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. LYTTELTON, Warwick, Leamington): I have received a telegram from the Governor of Malta stating that the Annual Account for the year 1903–4 would be ready on the 11th of July; it should, therefore, reach the Colonial Office in about a week from that date. The account will then be printed and laid before Parliament.

Prosecution of Fortune-tellers.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL (Armagh, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can state the number of prosecutions and convictions for palmistry and other species of fortune-telling from 1st March, 1901, till 30th June, 1904, in London and Birmingham, respectively.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): During the period in question there were in the Metropolitan Police District sixteen prosecutions of the nature indicated by the hon. Member and thirteen convictions. In Birmingham there were fourteen prosecutions and five convictions, with two cases still pending.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL: What class of people were prosecuted. Were they sixpenny, or two or three guinea fee-takers?

*MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: I will see if I can get the information for the hon. Member.

The Alleged Mutiny on board ss. "Homewood"—Composition of the Crew.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he has received any report from His Majesty's Consul at the Port of Brest, France, with regard to the alleged mutiny on board the British steamer "Homewood"; and whether he can state how many of the sailors and firemen were foreigners, and what were their nationalities, and also to state whether these men could speak and understand the English language.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): Yes, Sir, I have received a report from His Majesty's Consul at Brest in regard to a disturbance on board the "Homewood." There was no mutiny. One member of the crew assaulted another, and when the master attempted to handcuff the offender he was attacked by two of the dockers who were working on board the vessel. Members of the crew came, however, to the assistance of the master and protected him against further assault. The crew (other than officers) of the "Homewood," when the Articles were opened at Antwerp, consisted of four Germans, four Swedes, two Belgians, one Norwegian, one Swiss, one Turk, and two British. I have no information as to their knowledge of English.

MR. NANNETTI: Will the right hon. Gentleman inquire whether these men understood the English language.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I do not think that is necessary. They seem, under the circumstances, to have behaved very well.

Tuberculosis By-laws.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): On behalf of the hon. Member for the St. Patrick Division of Dublin, I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can state how many, and what, local authorities have adopted the model by-laws on tuberculosis issued by the Board; and whether, in the event of the sanitary authority refusing to adopt the model by-laws, there is any means of compelling them to do so.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): I presume that the hon. Member has in view the Model Regulations issued by my Department for the guidance of local authorities in framing regulations under the Dairies, Cowsheds, and Milkshops Order of 1885. Since 1899, when the present Model Regulations were issued, 583 series have been made by councils of boroughs and urban and rural districts, and they are for the most part based on the model. I am not empowered to compel local authorities to adopt the Model Regulations if they do not think fit to do so.

Inspection of Meat.

MR. LUNDON: On behalf of the hon. Member for the St. Patrick Division of Dublin, I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can state if the medical officers of health who are charged with the duty of judging meat alleged to be affected with tuberculosis have any special qualification for this position, or whether they have passed any examination in public health; and whether he will consider the necessity of issuing by-laws for their guidance with a view of protecting the private property of the traders in native meat and preventing the detrimental effect of unnecessary confiscation upon the producers of home meat.

MR. WALTER LONG: I am advised that the training which every registered medical practitioner must have received as a student is sufficient to render him competent to detect tuberculosis in a carcase. As every medical officer of health must be a registered medical practitioner, it is not necessary for the purpose mentioned in the Question that he should possess any special qualification. Circulars were issued by my Department in March, 1899, and September, 1901, drawing attention to the principles which should be observed in the inspection of tuberculous carcases, and I do not think I need take any further action in the matter at the present time.

MR. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.): Is it not the fact that many of the inspectors have no qualifications whatever for this work.

MR. WALTER LONG was understood to reply that that observation would not apply to medical officers of health to whom the Question on the Paper referred, but it was the case that some of the inspectors were in no way qualified.

Kilrusheightey School Teacher's Salary.

MR. P. A. MCHUGH (Leitrim, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Resident Commissioner of National Education in Ireland wrote on the 23rd March last to the Very Rev. John Melvin, parish priest, manager of Kilrusheightey National School, county Sligo, informing him that the Commissioners would be surcharged by the Auditor-General if the salary of the principal teacher of the school was increased by giving him credit for the sum of £7 14s. 6d., which he had earned for tuition in agriculture within the three years ended 31st March, 1900; if so, will he explain to the House the circumstances under which the Resident Commissioner endeavours to transfer to the Auditor-General the responsibility of the Commissioners of National Education for a failure to comply with Rule 200 in calculating the consolidated income of the principal teacher of the school mentioned; has this case been submitted to the Auditor-General; and is that official entitled to supervise the Commissioners' interpretation of Rule 200.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The reply to the first inquiry is in the affirmative. Payments made by the Commissioners in such cases are governed by regulations which have been approved by Government and the Treasury, and are audited by the Controller and Auditor-General, who is authorised by statute to surcharge any payment made in contravention of the regulations. The case in question has not come under the notice of the Controller and Auditor-General because no payment was made.

MR. P. A. MCHUGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland were bound, under Rule 200, to take into account all sums earned by teachers from State sources for work actually performed within the three years ended 31st March, 1904; that the principal teacher of Kilrusheightey (county Sligo) was paid a sum of £7 14s. 6d. for tuition in agriculture given within the period stated; that the manager of this school, Very Rev. John Melvin, P.P., has repeatedly insisted that that sum (£7 14s. 6d.) should have been taken into account by the Commissioners when fixing the teacher's consolidated income; and that the Commissioners have refused to take it into account; and, if so, will he say under what authority have the Commissioners departed in this case from the provisions of Rule 200; and has the manager any appeal from their decision.

MR. WYNDHAM; The period referred to in Rule 200 is the triennial period ended 31st March, 1900. Subject to this correction the reply to the first inquiry is in the negative. The consolidated incomes of teachers were calculated on emoluments actually paid within that period. The payment in the present instance was not so made, and in any case it was never contemplated by the Rules, as I have already explained, that grants covering services in respect of a period of six months should be continued in perpetuity under the form of consolidated income. The Commissioners reserved to themselves, with the approval of the Treasury, the right to give special consideration to cases in which any of the regulations in Rule 200 would operate inequitably. This right was exercised in a large number of cases at considerable additional expenditure. The claim of the Rev. Mr. Melvin was also several times considered by them, but they saw no reason for coming to the conclusion that it could be sustained.

Irish Intermediate Education—Committee of Inquiry.

MR. FLYNN (Cork County, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will say when was the Committee of Inquiry now investigating the working of the system of intermediate education in Ireland appointed; what are the terms of reference to the Committee; who are the gentlemen who constitute the Committee; what educational experience do they possess; what is the nature of the inquiries they are making; and who are the witnesses called, if any.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Committee was appointed on 2nd May. The inquiries are directed to the general conditions of the organisation of intermediate education in Ireland; its relations with primary and technical education; the staffing and equipment of schools; the allocation of the Board's funds; the training and salaries of teachers. The members of the Committee are Mr. F. H. Dale, an Inspector of Schools under the English Board of Education; and Mr. Stephens, late Inspector of Schools for the Victoria University, and now one of His Majesty's Inspectors of Schools. About eighty intermediate schools have been visited, as well as some of the training colleges. The Committee conferred with many educational authorities of different denominations and with teachers of schools.

MR. FLYNN: By what authority was the Committee appointed?

MR. WYNDHAM: By the authority of the Lord-Lieutenant.

Queen's College (Belfast) Professors.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state whether any appointments, outside their professional appointments, are held by the professor of English, the professor of chemistry, the professor of logic, and the professor of pathology, at Queen's College, Belfast; whether he can state if their college work is limited to five months in the year; and whether he has received any representations as to the necessity for the appointment of assistants at the public cost.

MR. WYNDHAM: The professors in question hold no appointments other than examinerships. The Clark Lectureship, conferred by Trinity College, Cambridge, is also held by the professor of English. So far from the work of the professors being limited, as suggested, to a period of five months, in the year, the professors in some cases are only able to obtain a vacation of six weeks. The reply to the last query is in the negative.

Mr. MACVEAGH: Is it the case that the sittings only extend over five months in the year?

Mr. WYNDHAM: I will deal with that in answer to another Question.

Irish Queen's Colleges.

Mr. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state in how many months of the year education is imparted at the Queen's College, Belfast, and for how many months of the year, including vacation periods, it is closed; and whether he can state if the periods of repose are similar at the Queen's College, Galway, and the Queen's College, Cork.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The period of the college session at Belfast, as at Galway and Cork, is regulated by statute and is the same in the case of each of these colleges. It commences on the third Tuesday in October and terminates on the second Saturday in June. Much of the so-called vacation between June and October is taken up with examinations of the Royal University, at which the professors and students are occupied.

Mr. MACVEAGH: Are they not paid extra in connection with these examinations?

Mr. WYNDHAM: I cannot say.

Lectures in Queen's College, Belfast.

Mr. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state how many courses of lectures, advertised to be delivered in the Queen's College, Belfast, on music and on sound, have been abandoned for want of audiences, and what public cost was entailed on those occasions in fees and otherwise.

Mr. WYNDHAM: No such courses of lectures were abandoned for the reason stated, or any other reason, and no public cost was entailed.

Westropp Estate, County Clare.

Mr. SHEEHY (Meath, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will say what reply the Estates Commissioners have received to the request made to the Land Judge's Court on behalf of the tenants on the Westropp Estate, county Clare; and whether the property is to be sold in compliance with the request.

Mr. WYNDHAM: On receipt of the request, the Land Judge wrote to the Estates Commissioners reminding them that offers for purchase had been previously made to the tenants under the 40th Section of the Act of 1896, and refused by the majority of the tenants. The Land Judge also pointed out that at the time of the consideration of the Land Commission report upon which these offers were based, the tenants had the fullest opportunity of being heard, and the prices named were most carefully considered by the Land Judge. In these circumstances, the Judge did not deem it expedient at present that proceedings should be taken under the 7th Section of the Act of 1903.

Mr. SHEEHY: Can the right hon. Gentleman state what offer was made to the tenants by the Land Judge?

Mr. WYNDHAM: No, Sir.

In reply to a further Question Mr. Wyndham said the matter was one which deserved and should have his careful attention.

Glen (Kerry) Boat-Slip.

Mr. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the state of the boat-slip at Glen, county Kerry; and, if so, whether, in view of the fact that the fishing season will shortly commence, the Congested Districts Board will complete the slip and undertake the construction of a breakwater.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The Board recently expended a sum of £360 on the extension of this boat-slip. The construction of a breakwater would cost many thousands of pounds, but no further expenditure than that already incurred is contemplated by the Board.

Kanturk Land Appeals.

Mr. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will explain why appeals in land cases from the Assistant Commissioner and from County Court Judges, which concern the Kanturk, county Cork, district, are heard in Killarney instead of Cork; and whether, in view of the additional expense to solicitors, tenants, and witnesses, as also the delay involved, the Land Commission will arrange to hear these appeals in Cork or Mallow, or other convenient centre in the county of Cork.

Mr. WYNDHAM: There is direct railway communication between Kanturk and Killarney and the former is nearer to Killarney than to Cork. Killarney is regarded as the most convenient centre for the hearing of appeals, and no additional expense, I am informed, has been placed upon the parties by having their cases heard in Killarney, which was selected to suit the public convenience.

Mr. FLYNN: Is it not possible to consult the convenience of those most concerned in these cases?

Mr. WYNDHAM: It is impossible to suit everybody's convenience.

Strabane Labourers' Cottage Scheme.

Mr. McFADDEN (Donegal, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Henry McCool, of Druminany, Raphoe, county Donegal, in the year 1899 applied to the Strabane No. 2 Rural District Council for a labourer's cottage, on the ground that his house had been condemned by the medical officer of health as unfit for habitation; that the Local Government Board for Ireland wrote to Henry McCool on the 23rd July, 1901, that steps were being taken to carry out an improvement scheme under which he would be provided with a cottage; that in 1902 McCool was compelled to leave his house, on the ground that a labourer's cottage was about to be built on its site, and had to take lodgings in the house of a neighbour; that a labourer's cottage was built on the site of the old house and on its completion was given to a man named Porterfield who did not belong to the district at all; and whether, seeing that McCool has now got notice to leave the lodgings where he has resided since 1902 and cannot get accommodation in the district, the Local Government Board will direct the Strabane No. 2 Rural District Council to take steps to provide him with a cottage.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The statements in the Question are accurate, but they omit an important factor in the case—namely, that the cottage was originally applied for by Porterfield. The district council has decided to let the cottage to this man, and it appears that the council is now preparing a further scheme which includes a cottage for McCool.

Rae Estate, Kerry.

Mr. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what steps have been taken by the Congested Districts Board for Ireland with a view to purchase the Rae Estate, Keel, county Kerry; what are the instructions given to the engineer who, since February last, has spent a few days on the estate; when will he be required to furnish his report; and whether he will be instructed to secure the voluntary co-operation of the tenants in preparing his report.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The Board is still in correspondence with the owners of this property. When it is in possession of certain information for which it has applied to the owners, it will consider the question of the purchase of the estate. The Chief Inspector has not yet visited the estate.

Irish Language for Irish Postal Officials.

Mr. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he has received copies of resolutions passed by the county councils of Wexford, Meath, Dublin, and Tipperary (S.R.), by thirteen urban district councils, nine rural district councils, and fourteen boards of guardians in various parts of of Ireland, requesting to have Irish made a subject of examination for postal officials in Ireland, and to have a knowledge of Irish required in making appointments of postmasters and postmen; whether he is aware that in the official advertisement of the vacancy for the postmastership of Carnarvon the words, "a knowledge of Welsh is necessary," occur; and whether he proposes to have the resolutions of these elected councils in Ireland carried into effect.

THE POSTMASTER - GENERAL (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): I have received copies of resolutions passed by various local bodies in Ireland urging the adoption of Irish as a subject of examination for postal officials in Ireland, and the introduction of a rule requiring a knowledge of that language by all postmasters and postmen. The conditions under which Irish is used as a spoken or written language do not appear to me to be such as to render such a measure necessary. In certain districts of Wales a knowledge of Welsh is necessary; and this fact was mentioned in the advertisement of the vacancy in the postmastership of Carnarvon.

MR. BOLAND: If the noble Lord gets resolutions from every district council will he kindly consider the matter?

LORD STANLEY: Oh yes, I will consider it.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): Will you consider it favourably?

[No Answer was returned.]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): I wish to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Finance Bill will be taken on Monday?

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): Yes. On Monday and Tuesday.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): Has any fixture been made for the next stage of the Navy Estimates?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, Sir.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): Are we to understand that the Licensing Bill will not be taken next week?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, Sir. I can only say that we shall take the Finance Bill on Monday and Tuesday.

NEW WRIT.

New Writ for the County of Salop (Western or Oswestry Division), in the room of the hon. George Ralph Charles Ormsby-Gore, now Baron Harlech, called up to the House of Peers.—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*)

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES.)

Mr. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Members from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures; Dr. MacDonnell, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Runciman, Mr. Channing, and Mr. William McKillop; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Clancy, Mr. O'Shee, Mr. Lundon, Mr. Joseph Nolan, and Mr. McHugh.

Report to lie upon the Table.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Mr. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had added to the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures, the following fifteen Members in respect of the Labourers (Ireland) Bill: Mr. Moore, Mr. Charles Craig, Mr. O'Doherty, Dr. Thompson, Mr. Joseph Devlin, Mr. Hayden, Mr. O'Shaughnessy, Mr. Kilbride Mr. Cullinan, Captain Donelan, Mr. Sheehan, Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. Sloan, Mr. Corbett, and Mr. O'Neill.

Report to lie upon the Table.

NEW BILLS.

ISLE OF MAN (CUSTOMS) BILL.

"To amend the Law with respect to Customs Duties in the Isle of Man," presented by Mr. Victor Cavendish; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 269.]

CRIMINAL ALIENS BILL.

"To make provision for the repatriation of Criminal Aliens," presented by Sir Howard Vincent; supported by Mr. Forde Ridley, Sir Carne Rasch, Sir Ernest Flower, Mr. Runciman, Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. Herbert Robertson, and Colonel Pilkington; to be read a second time upon Friday, and to be printed. [Bill 270.]

LICENSING BILL [3RD ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 4:—

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's) moved to omit the words from "confirming" to "county borough" in order to insert the words "the county licensing committee to confirm new licences, and any other power of that committee shall." The object of the Amendment, he said, was almost entirely consequent on the Amendments which had already been accepted by the Government limiting the compensation clauses of the Bill to existing licences. As the Bill was first adopted the compensation clauses applied to new licences. It was therefore necessary to provide that in the case of the non-county boroughs the county quarter sessions should consent to the grant of new licences; but now that the compensation clauses of the Bill only applied to existing licences, this necessity no longer existed and the provision which required consent to be given by quarter sessions might therefore be omitted. Non-county boroughs would retain exactly the same power which they had now over new licences. They would have the same confirming authority, viz., the whole body of magistrates or the special committee as the case might be. He thought that this Amendment would meet, at all events, if not entirely, in a very large degree, the Amendments which were on the Paper in the names of the hon. Members for Anglesey, Lancaster, Flint, and Huddersfield. As regarded county boroughs the Government, after having heard what had been said during the Second Reading and in the earlier stages of the Committee, had decided not to interfere with the present confirmation of new licences, so that the whole body of justices, acting for the borough, would continue to act as the confirming authority and need not, unless they wished to do so, appoint a special committee. So far as the county quarter sessions were concerned, they would appoint a committee, but the committee which they would appoint would be in substitution of the licensing committee which they now appointed and which now acted. Sub-section 1, as they proposed to amend it, was therefore limited to the provision necessary to transfer to quarter sessions the present statutory powers which were possessed by the licensing committee of quarter sessions for the purpose of confirming licences. It was really the same authority, but a new committee would have to be appointed, and they would deal with new licences as well as with the question of the extinction of licences which had been reported to them as redundant by the brewster sessions. The same committee in the county and the same body of justices in the county borough would deal both with the confirmation of new licences and with references from the licensing justices as to the renewal of existing licences. The Committee would see that the Government had gone very far to meet many of the suggestions which had been made both from non-county and county borough Members, and he trusted they would think that the proposals they had made were an improvement on the Bill. They certainly simplified the powers very much indeed, because they left, to a very much greater extent than was formerly proposed, the jurisdiction where it was before.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 8, to leave out from the word 'of' to the word 'be,' in line 10, and to insert the words, 'the county licensing committee to confirm new licences, and any other power of that committee shall."—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. HELME (Lancashire, Lancaster) said that on behalf of the interest represented by the non-county boroughs he desired to thank the Home Secretary for the consideration and courtesy with which he had received the deputations which had waited upon him. He reserved to the Report stage the raising of the question of non-county boroughs having powers equal to those conferred upon county boroughs where the population exceeded 25,000. In such boroughs the compensation area was sufficiently large and valuable to allow such powers to be exercised without any injury to the principle contained in the Bill.

Mr. LLOYD WHARTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon) said that hitherto the licensing bodies had put forward a claim for a new licence. They had sat on the county licensing committees and had made recommendations for new licences. The county licensing committee in dealing with the whole county had inquired into these cases and had either confirmed or rejected the original suggestions. Now, if he understood the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman rightly, the county licensing committee would cease to be the *qua* licensing authority, and the powers of the committee would be relegated to quarter sessions, who, he supposed, would delegate them again to the new committee, which would clear away difficulties that might arise from having two committees, one a licensing committee and the other what they might call a compensation committee. They had a provisional power given to county boroughs which, instead of sending their claims to the new licensing committees, would formulate their own licensing committees and would either confirm or reject the recommendations of the brewster sessions, so that there would be considerable access of power to justices in county boroughs.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) asked if it was made perfectly clear that quarter sessions could delegate their powers under Section 4 to the committee to be appointed under Section 5. He thought there was some danger it might be suggested there was no such power of delegation. Personally he was in favour of it.

The SOLICITOR-GENERAL (Sir Edward Carson, Dublin University): Yes, I think it is quite clear.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: It will be the county licensing committee after all.

Sir EDWARD CARSON: Not the existing licensing committee but one in lieu of it.

Mr. MANSFIELD (Lincolnshire, Spalding), inquired whether, supposing the licensing justices refused an application for a new licence, quarter sessions or their committee would have power to override their decision and grant the new licence.

*Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS: No, quarter sessions cannot override their decision in such a case.

Mr. WHITLEY (Halifax) asked if the Government were prepared to insert provisions to ensure that the inhabitants of a district affected had full notice of any intention to apply for a new licence so that they might attend the Court and put forward their views. Every possible avenue for the expression of public opinion should be left open.

Sir EDWARD CARSON replied that under the law as it stood there was a very elaborate system of notice insisted on as a precedent to applications for new licences.

Question put, and negatived.

Words inserted.

Mr. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.) moved an Amendment to give power to quarter sessions to sanction or vary any conditions attached to a new licence under the provisions of the section. His object was to extend the powers of quarter sessions. A new licensing system was practically to be set up, and personally he thought it a considerable improvement on the present one. It was in fact much more elastic. He believed it would work satisfactorily provided that there was some power of controlling within reasonable limits the various conditions that might be attached to licences. The present power of quarter sessions only extended to confirming or not confirming; but if they were to extend the power of the licensing justices in the way proposed by the Home Secretary, he thought they must also make a corresponding extension of the powers of quarter sessions, which ought to have the power to refuse conditions attached to licences.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 11, after the word 'sessions' to insert the words 'and shall include the power to sanction any conditions attached to a new licence under the provisions of this section.'"—(*Mr. Henry Hobhouse.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.) said the point raised by his right hon. friend was one well worthy of consideration. His right hon. friend suggested that when new licences were granted there should be some power in quarter sessions so to vary the conditions imposed by local magistrates that there should be some kind of uniformity in the terms on which the new licences were granted. Personally he was rather in favour of leaving such liberty to the local magistrates as might produce a large variety of experiment in this matter. On the whole he was disposed to think that, instead of having a controversy between the local magistrates and quarter sessions as to the terms upon which in a given locality new licences should be granted, they might leave the power with the local magistrates. He thought they would have a very valuable series of experiments made, some of which would doubtless be abortive, but none of which, so far as he could see, would inflict injustice on individuals, because from the nature of the case a man who took a new licence knew the conditions under which he took it, and if he did not think those conditions were tolerable he had the liberty of refusing to enter into the contract.

SIR ROBERT REID (Dumfries Burghs) said he was not in favour of the Amendment, because he did not desire to see the authority of the local magistrates more circumscribed than it was at present. Quarter sessions might say to a licensee, "If you are not prepared to accept modifications in the sense that we desire we shall refuse to confirm the licence."

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE said that if quarter sessions had power to bargain with the licensee his object would be achieved; but it seemed to him they must either confirm or veto the licence. As the Government were not prepared to accept the Amendment he asked leave to withdraw it.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*MR. WHITTAKER (Yorkshire, W. R., Spen Valley) moved the following proviso, "Provided that no new licence shall be granted before the 1st day of January, 1907." He regarded the provisions of the clause in regard to the granting of new licences as a considerable improvement on the original Bill, but he could not help feeling that the discussion on these important although somewhat crude proposals was being rushed. The fact that the Government had already altered their scheme showed the difficulty and complexity of the problem for the discussion of which they were only being allowed one day. He wished to recognise that the revised proposal of the Government was a genuine attempt to propound a *bona fide* scheme for the issue of new licences in the interests of the public. There was no trace of the brewer in this proposal, and he was, perhaps, a little strengthened in his support of it by the fact that the trade papers were strongly condemning it. The object of his Amendment was to relieve the licensing justices of the necessity of dealing with that very complicated and difficult problem just at the moment when they had the new reduction proposals on their hands. The justices under the revised clause would fix the price to be charged for a licence for a period of seven years; and he thought that when they had had a year or two's experience in dealing with the question of compensation for non-renewal they would have gathered a large amount of very useful information as to the value of a licence and the conditions which ought to be attached to it. They were framing the new licensing system somewhat in a hurry, and one advantage of deferring the granting of new licences for two years would be that the Government would have an opportunity of reconsidering the whole matter. Many difficult problems were connected with the granting of new licences. There was the question whether there should be a heavy licence fee, fixed according to population if they liked, which would keep down the number of licences simply by the amount which would have to be paid, or whether they should adopt a system under which persons should tender, stating how much they would give for a licence. For these and other reasons it would be well to postpone for two years the granting of new licences.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 8, at beginning, to insert the words 'No new licences shall be granted before the 1st day of January, 1907, and after that date.'"—(*Mr. Whittaker.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

COLONEL PILKINGTON (Lancashire, Newton) thought it would be a very great pity to interfere in any way with the discretion of the magistrates in the granting of new licences. The matter had been dealt with by the Home Secretary and the Solicitor-General with the greatest care and ability, and in his opinion the sooner the magistrates got to work the better. The hon. Member must not forget that many benches of licensing magistrates had already formulated schemes for a reduction in the number of licensed houses, and had obtained full particulars of the premises it was proposed to deal with, so that the pressure on them immediately after the passing of the Bill was not so great as he had suggested.

*MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS dissented from the view of the hon. Member for the Spen Valley that the discussion was being rushed. He could not accept the Amendment. He had always had sympathy with the view that very few licences ought to be granted. But he did not see the necessity for the Amendment, because the magistrates would have the power to refuse to issue new licences for two years if they thought well to do so, and because, in the interest of growing districts which would require new licences to satisfy their needs, it would not be right to fetter the discretion of the magistrates.

MR. BROADHURST (Leicester) feared that the Home Secretary had not appreciated the full force of the argument advanced by the hon. Member for the Spen Valley. What it was desired to point out was that in the administration of this great and complicated Act the magistrates would be overburdened with work, and, therefore, it was quite a reasonable suggestion to suspend the granting of new licences for two years, when the magistrates would have more time to give to the consideration of the matter. After all, the main object of the Bill was to reduce the number of drinking shops, and surely it was not a very drastic proposal to suggest that no new licences should be granted for two years. As a rule licensing justices were men who were engaged in other businesses, and it was not right to make too heavy calls on their time.

*MR. WHITTAKER asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 11, to leave out from the word 'sessions' to end of sub-section."—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Amendment agreed to.

*MR. WHITTAKER next moved to add at the end of the sub-section—"(1) No application for a new licence shall be received or considered by the justices of a licensing district unless and until they have issued a public notice that in their opinion a new licence is required in a particular locality, and they are prepared to receive applications for it." This was, he said, one of the recommendations in the

Majority Report of the Royal Commission on Licensing, and he hoped, therefore, it would receive the support of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Ripon. The proposal was a very simple one. His object was to save the magistrates from being badgered and worried by people coming continually with applications for new licences in the hope that some year they would influence a majority of the Court. It would be a very great advantage indeed if the magistrates had greater control and if it were left for them in the first place to decide where new licences were required and to invite suitable applications.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 11, at end, to insert the words '(1) No application for a new licence shall be received or considered by the justices of a licensing district unless and until they have issued a public notice that in their opinion a new licence is required in a particular locality and they are prepared to receive applications for it.' "—(*Mr. Whittaker.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR EDWARD CARSON said he hoped the hon. Member would not press his Amendment. He had great doubts whether many persons would apply for new licences under the stringent conditions imposed by the Bill; but supposing in a new and growing district an hotel was built, was the owner to wait before he could apply for a licence until the justices of the licensing district had made up their minds about the necessity of a new licensed hotel in the locality? Was it not much better that the person applying for the licence should give evidence before the magistrates as to the necessity for such an hotel, and that on hearing that evidence the licensing magistrates should make up their minds as to whether or not they should grant the licence? The hon. Member must know that at present the greatest pains were taken to make known that an application for a licence had been lodged with the magistrates. There had to be publication of it in the papers for a month or more before the licence could be granted, and also on the site and on certain public buildings. Any member of the public had the power to come before the magistrates to object to the granting of the licence, and have his side of the case thrashed out. He could not see that anything would be gained by the Amendment.

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.) said that as he had placed on the Paper an Amendment with the same object but in another form, he wished to say a word or two in support of the proposal of his hon. friend. The Home Secretary had just said that it was undesirable to restrict the power of the licensing magistrates, and now they were told by the Solicitor-General that it was undesirable to extend the powers of the magistrates to represent their locality in dealing with this question of new licences. The magistrates were trusted with the duty of granting licences because they were supposed to be the most soberminded men in dealing with licences in their own locality; and they should be allowed to form their own judgment as to the time at which they should deal with the needs of their own district. He thought the Amendment was in the right direction, and it was supported by those authorities which the Government ought to respect.

Question put, and negatived.

SIR EDWARD GREY (Northumberland, Berwick) said that the Amendment which he wished to move raised two questions of very great importance. One was as to the advisability of having some change in the system under which the liquor trade was to be carried on; and the other was that an opportunity should be given to public opinion to express itself through a representative public authority. Many who were interested in temperance reform had been for some time of opinion that one of the most hopeful directions in which that reform could be carried out was that of endeavouring to have a change in the system of the liquor trade. As at present carried on it was inevitable that the sale of liquor should be pushed to the utmost degree possible. And, whilst it was his object to eliminate this, his Amendment would not interfere in any way with the liberty of people who wished to obtain alcoholic liquor. His object was to discourage the system of pushing the sale of liquor. He knew, of course, that the Amendment was open to one criticism, that if they got rid of the incentive to drink for the good of the landlord or the good of the house, it was only to substitute the incentive to drink for the good of the parish. That was a possible danger to which the system was open, but he would point out that, in his Amendment, there was nothing to restrict the disposal of the profits. It would be for purposes so wide—purposes of general utility that there would be no incentive to push the sale of liquor in any particular locality. The Amendment had been drawn in such a way as to guard against any such danger as he had described. After having got rid of the incentive to push the sale of liquor, he provided that the profits should be devoted to counter-attractions to the public-house. [AN HON. MEMBER: To fountains?] What was in his mind when he spoke of counter-attractions was that in every village there should be a place of resort—a public hall or club for social entertainment, where village societies could meet and spend their time in interesting and profitable discussions. "Counter-attractions," of course, was not quite the full description of what he meant. Public halls were in themselves eminently desirable, whether there was a public-house close by or not. The phrase had been drawn intentionally wide, because it would include fountains up to the highest form of scientific education.

As to the second most important point in the Amendment, it was to bring in a representative authority. Now, he quite saw that they could not bring in a representative authority in such a way as to confuse the administration of the licensing authority. But, if the local authority were given no administrative power whatever, and only an opportunity of passing resolutions in regard to the issue of new licences, he thought that might be done in such a way as not to lead to confusion in administration. Under this Bill it was impossible to change the administrative authority from the justices to a representative authority; and if his Amendment would entail anything of that kind he admitted that it would be against the principle of the Bill. At the same time he, and those who thought with him, had never looked upon the justices as the ideal authority to decide all questions in regard to licences; and just as they were beginning to have some hope of a change in the system, their hopes had been dashed by the introduction of this Bill. He wished the introduction of a representative authority, because he believed that in recent years public opinion had been ripening in regard to temperance reform, and had been keenly investigating possible methods of such reform. The Prime Minister himself had admitted that there was some hope in liberty of experiment in this matter. He entirely agreed that foolish experiments might be made; still in liberty of experiment there was really some hope of temperance reform. But there could be no liberty of experiment unless some opportunity was given for the expression of public opinion. He insisted that that opportunity of giving expression to the desire of the people for temperance reform could be afforded without conflicting with the administration of the licensing authority set up by the Bill. If it were the case, as everybody admitted, that the liquor trade and excess in drinking was a real national danger, and if that danger were greatly increased by leaving the trade in private hands, surely no opportunity of introducing a change in the present licensing system should be neglected. Excess was the real national danger, and if that danger were greatly increased, as it must be, by leaving the trade in private hands, and if it were the case that private hands had literally got the country by the throat, surely no opportunity of introducing a change of system in the future should be ignored.

So far as existing licences were concerned, the Amendment did not refer to them, but, where the creation of new licences was concerned, public opinion should be given the greatest possible opportunity of starting new and improved systems. The Prime Minister spoke somewhat disparagingly of temperance reformers as a hopeless body because they were never agreed. If they took too extreme a view of the matter it was difficult to get agreement, but he thought there were many creeks and inlets into which a favourable

Sir Edward Grey.

tide would flow if they only dug a channel for it. He wanted to dig a channel for it in that Amendment in which public opinion might flow. The real hope was not so much in a great general movement as in the fact that they would have one community more progressive than another, which afforded a practical way of advancing to which they should give every facility. He wanted any progressive communities to have an opportunity of having their say, and experiment to have a fair trial, in the hope of a better system of control of the liquor trade. Even if the number of new licences must be for many years comparatively small, and as he saw in the clause as moved by the Government nothing of the hand of the brewer, and no desire to tie licensing authorities down with regard to the new system, he would ask the Government whether they could not favourably consider his Amendment, which introduced the representative authority, and so gave facilities for the expression of public opinion without conflicting with the administrative powers of their own licensing authority, and to say whether it would not be desirable that they should give some invitation to local authorities to take steps in the direction of putting new licences, at any rate, under a better system than that which had hitherto had the monopoly of the trade.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 13, at end, to insert the words 'provided that a local authority may, by resolution, declare that no new on-licence shall be so granted or confirmed in respect of premises within their area except to a company or association of persons formed for the purpose of devoting any profits (or any such proportion of profits as may be specified in the resolution) to public purposes and complying with regulations made for the purpose by the Secretary of State, and any such resolution shall have effect accordingly.'"—(*Sir Edward Grey.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said there was a great deal in the general observations of the right hon. Baronet with which, as the Committee knew, he was in sympathy; but he did not think it would be desirable to adopt the Amendment which he had put upon the Paper; nor did he think that Amendment really carried out the general principles which the right hon. Baronet had laid down in his speech. He would not go into the question of how the money which could be derived from the sale of liquor in a parish or district could be applied for the entertainment and improvement of the inhabitants. He remembered the late Lord Salisbury suggested that if they wanted to amuse a parish the best way was by giving a circus rather than by giving a parish council; and he would venture to suggest to his hon. friend behind, who made interjectory interruption in the speech of the right hon. Baronet, that probably circuses would be more effective for that particular purpose than the fountain which his hon. friend would regard apparently as the substitute in this case. He did not gather that the intention of the right hon Baronet was to substitute a non-intoxicating for an intoxicating beverage, but rather to see if any profits made out of the monopoly value could be transferred to some public purpose. There were many temperance reformers who would regard that as a very serious blow to their own particular views as to how the cause of temperance could be best advanced. He neither shared their apprehensions in that matter nor did he share to the full some of the hopes which the right hon. Baronet expressed as to the substitution of companies like those indicated in the Amendment for the present system. He must honestly say he thought there had been an exaggeration in much temperance literature as to the degree of alcoholic consumption which was due to what was called pushing the sale of drink. He had not much experience in those matters, but his own impression was that the people drank in public-houses because they wanted to drink, and not because the liquor was pressed upon them by the publican. There might be, and no doubt were, especially in country districts, cases in which the sale might be pressed to the great detriment of the locality and of the individuals who fell a prey to that temptation; but that the great bulk of the drinking in this country was regulated by the pressure put upon the consumer by the publican, and not by the pressure put upon the publican by the consumer, he had very great doubts. It was not really those considerations, which were subsidiary, on which he based his objection to that Amendment.

That Amendment was recommended to the Committee because it introduced the public opinion of the locality, and enabled it to pronounce in favour of a particular form of experiment in regard to the sale of alcoholic liquors. He quite understood the policy, though he did not agree with it, or think it would be desirable, at all events in the existing conditions, to say that every question connected with drinking facilities, so long as injustice were not inflicted on individuals, should be left to the locality itself. That was an intelligible but probably not an expedient policy; but he did not think the limited form proposed by the Amendment was consistent either with sound theory or practice. It would only allow the local authority to intervene in that question in one particular form and in favour of one particular kind of experiment. That seemed to him illogical and inconsistent with the general principles they desired to lay down, and also inimical to that other liberty of experiment which he regarded as one of the most valuable results of Clause 4 in its present shape. Under the Amendment the liberty of the local authority would be absolutely restricted to saying aye or no to that one particular question.

SIR EDWARD GREY: If the Govern- would insert the wider and larger Amendment I should be delighted to withdraw this. I thought, being small, it might be acceptable.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he thought if they were going to give power to the locality at all they should give the locality freedom all round. But they had gone throughout on the hypothesis that they were to interfere as little as possible with the magisterial management. That was the view embodied in the Bill, and it had received its most violent expression from hon. Gentlemen opposite. They had been obliged to change the magisterial authority in order to carry out the scheme of compensation, but where they could leave it alone they had done so. He did not think it would be wise in Clause 4 alone of the Bill to bring in for the first time the local authority as settling the precise kind of experiment which should be tried. He was not sure they would be well suited to carry that out, and it would be both illogical and imprudent in any case to say, "We cannot trust you with the whole decision on all the points that arise, but you are to have the power to say aye or no to the one particular form of experiment." He thought the public-house trust system a most proper experiment, and one well worthy of trial. Whether it was going to succeed, and going gradually to supplant other methods, he was not rash enough to prophesy, but it was an experiment which had been supported with the most earnest intentions of dealing with some of the evils in the country, and full liberty to try it with regard to new licences was left under the clause as they had drafted it. He would venture to suggest, however, they ought not to lay it down that in this particular, and in this particular alone, the local authorities should be dragged in, and be permitted to give a veto on any other than one particular form of experiment among the many forms of experiment which were open to the magistrates to try. For these reasons he hoped the Committee would agree with the Government in refusing to accept this limitation.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE thought it was unfortunate that the right hon. Gentleman could not meet the invitation of the right hon. Member for Berwick, and leave the whole matter in the hands of the local authorities. He considered local authorities should have greater powers in this matter than they had at present. The door, of course, was closed so far as existing licences were concerned, but they ought to have a *locus standi* whenever application was made for a new licence. At present the local authority had no right to appear before the magistrates, or instruct counsel to place the case for the locality officially before the Court of quarter sessions. It had been decided by the House of Lords that if a watch committee employed counsel for the purpose of presenting its views on a licensing question, the money so spent should be disallowed. He would suggest that where a new licence was applied for, notice should be given to the local authority of the district, and that the authority should be able to appear before the licensing magistrates and quarter sessions. It would be practically useless in London, for instance, to advertise these notices in the local newspapers, because they had a very poor circulation, and probably not one-tenth of the population ever saw them. The notice should be sent to the authority, and appear on the agenda paper of their meetings and be considered. He agreed that drinking did not depend on the pressure of the publican so much as it did on a man's sense of honour. A man who had nowhere else to spend the evening, and who had any sense of honour, felt that he could not sit in a public-house all the evening for 2d. That was the sort of pressure that existed. He felt he was not welcome if he did not spend, and therefore he continued to drink and spend his money. A man ought to be able to feel that he was just as welcome if he did not spend his money as if he did. A man was not scowled at in his club if he did not spend his money, and that was one of the elements of these great trusts. This question of licensing would never be settled except by means of experiment, and he thought they should not only be allowed to experiment, but encouraged to do so. But what was a good experiment in one district might be a bad experiment for another. He knew districts in Wales where prohibition was a success, but there were others where, if prohibition were tried, a wholesale defiance of the law would follow. The local authority would be much more likely to experiment, and therefore he would ask the Prime Minister to consider whether some means could not be devised which would give greater elasticity with regard to new licences. Not much harm would, at any rate, be done if the local authority were brought in, and it would test how they would set to work. In some districts it would be quite possible that the whole system of licensing would be recast, but that could only be done by trusting local opinion.

MR. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow) thought the Committee, at all events, were entitled to ask that the Amendment should be sufficiently clearly worded to ensure that the new licensed houses should be so managed that extra profits should not go to the brewers. It was only human nature that the brewers and distillers should endeavour to sell as much liquor as they possibly could, because it was their living. That was the result of the present system. It also had the effect of increasing the sale of inferior and doctored liquor, which ruined people's health and increased the craving for drink, a result from which the poor were the chief sufferers, because this inferior liquor was sold at a low price. The huge mistake that had been made in the past afforded a strong reason why every care should be taken against any such mistake in the future. As a loyal supporter he appealed to the Government to make it, as far as possible, certain that under all future licences it should not be in the interests of either owners or managers of licensed premises to increase the sale of beer or spirits. He hoped the Liberal Party, when they returned to power with serried ranks and gigantic battalions, would find a way of dealing with grocers' licences, which it was generally admitted had had the effect of teaching the women of England to drink.

SIR ROBERT REID said the Committee were now engaged in remodelling the licensing system so far as new licences were concerned, and that in itself was a matter of extreme importance. The Amendment proposed that in one direction the local authority should have power to require a particular experiment to be tried. That experiment was not municipalisation, but disinterested management, and under it a man would be able to enter a licensed house as a place of recreation, without feeling that he was obliged to spend more than he could afford. There was nothing in the idea of providing counter-attractions that ought to excite derision. The harder the life of the people, the more need was there for amusement and diversion, and the provision of that relaxation without the necessity to drink was an object of which every sensible man must thoroughly approve. Existing organisations for this purpose had done much good already, and with the experience they had secured they would doubtless do better in the future. The objection of the Prime Minister was not so much to the principle as to the empowering of the local authority to require the experiment to be tried, but the manner in which the right hon. Gentleman urged his objection rather gave the idea that he was not altogether beyond persuasion or pressure. The suggestions of the hon. Member for the Carnarvon Boroughs, that the local authority should be given a *locus standi* in the matter, would not do all that was required; but his further proposal that the relations between the local authority and the licensing authority should be considered was well worth attention. He would join his hon. friend in urging the Government to see whether something could not be done to give the local authority some potent voice—a consultative voice, if nothing more—in the granting of new licences. The field was absolutely open. Personally, he would like to supersede the justices by a complete scheme of local option. There was no chance of that, however, at present, but was it not possible to harmonise local opinion with the authority and power of the licensing justices? The question could not be properly discussed on the present occasion, but he hoped that before the Report stage the Government would consider whether they could do anything to assist in that direction.

Sir EDWARD CARSON said that one would imagine, from the discussion, that no regard had been had in the drafting of this clause for the interests of the experiment to which reference had been made. As the Prime Minister had stated, that experiment was a most valuable one, though whether it would eventually succeed was another matter. But the Committee must not be under the impression that the Government were not fostering that experiment. Under the proposal of the Home Secretary, power was to be given to the justices to attach "such conditions as they think best adapted for preventing any private person from obtaining any benefit for any monopoly value of the licence." That meant that the justices could attach such conditions as they pleased as to any proportion of profits being handed over for public purposes. There was to be no private gain in the matter. That provision would to a large extent help the trust experiment, because it was hardly conceivable that any private individual for a commercial speculation would accept such a proposition. It might happen, however, that an association carried on on non-dividend-earning lines might fail, and then the trust would come to an end, and the private individual would have to be set up again. The right hon. Baronet asked the Committee to go a step further, and empower the local authority to say that only to such a trust as was willing to agree to pay over the profits for public purposes would they grant new licences. That was an absolutely impracticable and impossible proposition. It might, in practice, amount to local option. In a new neighbourhood it was only as a matter of speculation that a hotel would be built. A trust was hardly likely to enter into such a speculation, so that the local authority would practically be empowered to say that no such hotel or refreshment room should be built. The same argument would apply to railway refreshment rooms, which were frequently carried on not for profit, but simply for the convenience of passengers. The right hon. Baronet would probably admit that in reality he was trying to introduce the thin end of the wedge of local option—a principle to which the Unionist Party had never in any way lent its support. To introduce that principle to the extent suggested in this Amendment would be a very serious matter. It might be a good or bad thing, but it could not be introduced into a Bill of this kind without having far-reaching consequences. A proposal had been made by the hon. and learned Member for Carnarvon to give the local authority a *locus standi*, but that was really the same principle as local option. In the case of an application for a new licence any member of the public might come in and object, or any member of the council. He regarded this Amendment as the thin end of the wedge for local option, and it would have more far-reaching consequences than it appeared at first sight to indicate.

Mr ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.) said the Solicitor-General had presented them with a new form of the simile of the thin end of the wedge, but the right hon. Gentleman could not have had in his mind at the time the legislation of his own Government in regard to Scotland.

What did the Government do in regard to Scotland? They actually gave direct representation to the local authority, and last year that principle was actually carried into effect in regard to Scotland. The Solicitor-General had asked what about hotels and railway stations? If the Government would accept the Amendment in substance and in spirit there would be no difficulty in moulding it into a form which would prevent any such cases of special hardships as those he had mentioned. The Solicitor-General asked what would happen supposing there were no trusts in the district prepared to undertake the matter? He did not think that was a very probable case, and a local authority under those circumstances would not pass any such resolution. If they did pass such a resolution it would be a clear indication of their view, in which one would imagine they were supported by the opinion of the locality, that it would be better not to have any public-houses at all rather than have them carried on merely for private profit under demoralising conditions. He doubted whether they would find any local authority, if there were no trusts, which would consider that it was fulfilling its obligations under this proviso by taking such a step. Let them clearly understand whether it was the opinion of the Government that this particular proposal should not be accepted here in England, and that local authorities as such should have no voice of any sort or kind and no power of remonstrance in its official capacity in regard to this great question. It had been determined in the House of Lords that local authorities could not lawfully expend the borough funds upon licensing appeals and that was a monstrous state of the law. He did not think there was any duty which could more properly be cast upon local authorities, and in the performances of which they could more rightly and justly resort to the rates, than that of expressing before the licensing justices what the general opinion of their district was in regard to public-house accommodation.

*MR. TALBOT (Oxford University) said he thought it was agreed on both sides of the House that the authority dealing with licensing questions should be the justices. He never could see why a distinction should be drawn between the justices acting in one place and the same justices acting in another place. This Amendment would prevent the justices from granting a new licence if the local authority said the licence must only be granted on the trust principle, because then the licensing justices were not to be allowed to grant that licence upon any other principle. That seemed to him to be interfering with the discretion of the magistrates which he wished to maintain. He would remind hon. Gentlemen opposite that the feeling upon this matter of licensing was not always on one side. From experience in his own county he could state that local opinion in favour of licensing was much stronger than local opinion on the other side, as expressed at the petty sessions and quarter sessions. He had often had great difficulty in persuading his colleagues to take the views he held against the granting of new licences because public opinion as expressed in Court was often on the side of licensed houses. The other day he was sitting as chairman of a licensing committee, and they had an application from a town in Kent to be made what was known as "a populous place," which allowed more time for drinking in the evening. Not without difficulty it was shown that there was another side to the question and the licensing committee took the bold line, and, in the face of all the local opinion, which seemed to preponderate on the other side, they determined to deny this boon. He mentioned that to show that local opinion was not always on the temperance side.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid) said the right hon. Gentleman opposite had given instances where local opinion had been expressed unfavourable to the temperance cause, but he did not think that argument would apply to the local authority. They could always get influential persons to give their individual opinion in one direction or the other, but if they trusted the local authority, which had the responsibility of acting not merely for themselves but for those they represented, it would in ninety-nine cases out of every hundred express the real wishes of the locality.

The Solicitor-General had directed his criticism chiefly to the particular form of the Amendment, but his right hon. friend had stated his willingness to amplify his Amendment in any way which would induce the Government to support it. The valuable part of the Amendment was the suggestion that they should bring into play in dealing with new licences the intervention of the local authority. It was quite true that, theoretically, any one had power to appear before the licensing justices, but all those who had had experience of licensing justices knew that the representations made either by petition, through the chairman of a public meeting, or by means of a committee, were really not allowed to have the influence they deserved before the local justices. In days gone by it was decided in many cases not to permit petitions to be presented, and they were simply placed upon the table. He wished to remind the Prime Minister that this was the only part of the Bill in which this proposal could properly be made. Here they were dealing with licences that might be granted in the future, and they said that the local authority should have some *locus standi* in the determination of the questions which arose. The right hon. Gentleman proposed to give very full power in the case of public-house trusts, but something might be done to introduce the local bodies. His hon. and learned friend had suggested that they should have some *locus standi* before the justices, and it was, he understood, his intention to move an Amendment dealing with that matter. It would not be denied by anybody on the other side of the House that it would come well within the proper power of a local authority, at any rate, to make some representation in regard to this matter. The local authority were entrusted with the care of the health of the people, and they had to police the district, and surely it was not too much to ask that they should have the right to make representations to the justices, and that they should be placed in such a position that the justices would not be able to brush them on one side entirely in connection with any representations they might make. The Solicitor-General had stated that notice of an ample kind had to be made to many people before an application for a new licence could be made. He thought it would be well now to determine that notice should be given to the local authority. If that were done the public authority would deal with the matter and determine to do something with regard to it. He would make it the duty of the local authority to consider a proposed application for a new licence, to determine one way or other with regard to it, and to make a representation of their views to the justices. If Parliament declared that the local authorities themselves should consider these very important questions, and make representations regarding them, the justices would feel for the first time the real force which ought to attach to the opinions of the representatives of the people. He entirely approved of the new Clause 4 so far as it went, but he hoped something would be put in to enable local authorities to make representations to the justices.

Mr. CORBETT (Glasgow, Tradeston) said it was very desirable that the local authority should have power to advise in this matter. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxford University said he agreed with the speeches on both sides. He found himself in the unhappy position of disagreeing with both parts of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman. He disagreed with the view that the local authority should not have any power of intervention, and he disagreed also with the very sanguine hope formed as to the experiment which the trusts were carrying out. Mr Charles Booth, no mean experimenter, had experimented with five houses, and his report was to the effect that the idea that a manager could decrease the alcoholic trade was disproved. A friend with whom he had a conversation informed him that he had been told by one of the trust managers lately, "If I offer my customers tea and coffee they are fit to kill me." If they had a publican carrying on his business for his own private profit with all the interest he used to have at stake, under a bench of magistrates, active and vigilant in their supervision over him, they got as efficient a means of carrying on the business as they were likely to have through a manager. A good deal had been said as to the elimination of the element of private profit, but people did not work for profit alone. They worked for success and they became as enthusiastic about success as about profit. He knew of two prohibition areas in the neighbourhood of London where the population entirely appreciated the prohibition. Whenever it was proposed to open a public-house on the borders of these areas the people were prepared with practical unanimity to sign petitions against it. He had received letter after letter from a public-house trust, urging him to have a trust public-house in one of these areas. He maintained that their desire to have a public-house in one of these areas where there was no liquor sold at present, and where the people did not want liquor to be sold, did not arise from love of temperance, which might have been the original cause of forming the trust, but to that love of success which took hold of a man whenever he engaged in a business enterprise. He had intervened in the debate to express his strong feeling that the hope attached to this kind of work was very apt to be disappointed.

*MR. WHITTAKER said he was very strongly in favour of power being given to local authorities to make representations to the justices. He had not seen his way to support the Amendment of his right hon. friend. He was not in favour of entrusting the licensing system to the local representative authorities, because he did not want to see this liquor business introduced into municipal elections. He thought the influences of the liquor traffic in municipal elections would be all to the bad. He could imagine the dining, and otherwise influencing, to which the members of local authorities would be subjected. He would like to see some means devised whereby they would get the opinion of the public direct. He did see a good deal of advantage, in suitable localities, of eliminating the matter of private interests in the sale of liquor. The Prime Minister had suggested that there was practically nothing in the contention that the publican pushed the sale of drink. If the right hon. Gentleman would study the tied house system of the country, he would find how great was the number of publicans who were turned out because they had not pressed the sale of liquor and had not sold enough. If it were not to induce people to go in and buy liquor, why had licence-holders spent so much money to make their places attractive? If the element of private profit could be got rid of a great deal would be done to shorten hours as had been done in Norway. Much had been accomplished in the way of providing parks and playgrounds for the outdoor enjoyment of the people. But they were apt to forget that a majority of working people could only enjoy these places for a short time. He suggested that there should be provided "indoor parks," in the shape of free clubs and places of recreation, altogether disconnected with places of worship or instruction, and conducted with the utmost freedom, and quite clear of liquor. It was the social instinct which brought men together in the public-houses, and if such clubs as he had suggested were established much could be done to meet the great evil of drinking clubs which were springing up up and down the country. To close public-houses and yet allow drinking clubs to spring up would be to make very little headway indeed. The only way to grapple with the drinking club was to provide counter-attractions under the management of local authorities. He was very much attracted by the idea of getting the money to provide these counter-attractions from the liquor trade

His objection to the trusts associated with the name of Lord Grey was, first of all, that they brought very definite and potent pressure to bear in applications for new licences, thereby increasing the number of licences. They brought pressure of a potent kind to bear, because those connected with the trusts were all influential noblemen and gentlemen in their localities. These noblemen and gentlemen waited upon the bench of magistrates and urged that licences should be granted. In that way they could bring a pressure to bear which no private individual could do. Their contention was that all they asked for was that if the justices were prepared to grant a licence, the licence should be granted to them. But in practice they were pressing for licences in districts where there were already numerous licences; and consequently they were a very potent influence aiming at the increase of public-houses. His second objection was that the money was to be used for local purposes. That was a species of bribery to the local justices to grant a licence. If the profits were to be used to endow an hospital, a new library, or a nurse, it would be a very great inducement to grant an additional licence which would not otherwise be granted. The right hon. Baronet suggested that the gifts should be distributed over a wide area; but there was nothing of that in the Amendment.

The Solicitor General had referred to the complications which might ensue. He agreed that the many difficulties surrounding this proposal of the right hon. Baronet were too extensive to be discussed on this Amendment. One point of importance not mentioned in the Amendment of the right hon. Baronet, or in the amended clause the Government had put on the Paper, was the rate of interest that was to be allowed to these public-house trusts. He could see that a 5 per cent. investment might become very attractive indeed, especially if there was a tinge of philanthropy connected with it; and that the investor persuaded himself that he was thereby working in the direction of temperance reform. He was quite in favour of wide-spread local experiments; but they should be made under safeguarded conditions. He thought that disinterested management of public-houses would be of little value anywhere unless the company or the local authority had the control of all the licensed houses in the locality. A single house with disinterested management would have no value whatever. Before they could embark on the principle of disinterested management they ought to have a very well thought-out scheme; and such a scheme could not be introduced into this Bill. The Amendment did not propose that licences should be granted to a municipality, and he was glad to note that, because he believed it would be fatal. To grant licences to a municipality would be jumping out of the frying-pan into the fire. It was because the Amendment of the right hon. Baronet introduced in the crudest way the possibility of the element of public profit out of the sale of liquor that he much regretted that he could not see his way to support it.

SIR EDWARD GREY said he had moved his Amendment in the hope that the Government might see their way to accept it. It had been drafted on a limited scale in the anticipation that the Government would think it possible to admit it into the rather close meshes they had drawn round their Bill. But as the Government would not accept the small experiment which he had suggested he would not press his Amendment to a division. However, he felt very strongly that the local representatives were not to have any say at all in the granting of licences. The Solicitor-General said that this was the thin end of the wedge of local option. Well, in a sense it was, if local option was used in a wide sense, and not in that of local veto. He did not know why the thin end of the wedge should not be inserted here as well as in the Transvaal, which was not a highly democratic community. He had no desire to press this particular Amendment to a division; but he thought the sense of the House ought to be taken on the question of whether the representative authority was to have any say or any interest whatever in the direction of a trade which was admitted to be one of great danger.

MR. HARWOOD (Bolton) said that the ideal of the hon. Member for Spen Valley was a land in which there should be no public-houses. His ideal was a land where there were enough public-houses. The question before the Committee was whether they were to have public-houses managed by trusts from philanthropic motives. He thought the Prime Minister rather under-estimated the power of the managers of tied houses in pushing the sale of drink. The tied house system had enormously increased during the last twenty years. In the old days a publican had a sort of pride in his business. It was a kind of a social institution; not a mere money-making establishment. Under the new system there was a decrease of the places in the public-houses where a man could sit down and quietly enjoy his evening. He thought if the Prime Minister, who did not seem to travel abroad much, were to go over to the Continent, he might see, for instance in France, what an ideal public-house was. There a man could sit all the evening, and write his letters, and have his glass of beer, or cup of coffee, and feel comfortable. But that could not be done in a tied house. His own opinion was that the local authority should have, in questions of granting new licences, not an authoritative position, but a consultative position. From a practical business point of view, he thought that a new licence should be sold by auction. In that way a very large sum of money would be obtained for public purposes. There ought to be some elasticity for experiments in a new system of licensing; but no bench of licensing magistrates would sanction these experiments unless they had the strengthening advice of the local authorities. Therefore, the local authority ought to be able to express the feeling of the community as a whole in regard to new licences. The Prime Minister said that any one could appeal to the licensing magistrates, but he could only do so individually and not as one speaking for the community. He urged on the Prime Minister to allow the local authority to have a consultative voice in the granting of a new licence.

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON (Leith Burghs) said that a great deal had been urged that afternoon as to the advantage of experiments being made on a new licensing system on right lines. He thought that the Amendment of his right hon. friend would fairly ensure that experiments might be made on trust lines, but it did not leave the way open to the adoption of a high licence system. It was said that under the Government scheme high licences would be possible. But, although high licences might, to a certain extent, destroy the monopoly, they would not promote temperance, because the man who had to pay a high licence would press the sale of liquor even more than a man who only had to pay a low licence. He would support the Amendment, not in the interests of the trusts, but because he did not believe that the Government scheme was on the right lines. His hon. friend had referred to trusts; but there was one variety of trust which had not been mentioned. That was the village trust started by miners in villages in Scotland, and run by them under extraordinarily difficult circumstances but with great financial success. He admitted that that was rather a dangerous form of trust, especially where a village was deriving a large income from the public-house. It would be far better if the Government recognised the trust system, and provided that the profits should be spread over a large area and not concentrated in one hard-drinking village. It was time that the whole system should be put on a better thought-out basis than that on which it now rested. These drinking clubs were extending from Scotland to the North of England, and they were on the highway to similar village trusts there to those which existed in Scotland.

MR. OSMOND WILLIAMS (Merionethshire) said he wished to support the Amendment. The principle of legislation in this country for years had been in the direction of decentralisation. The Bill, however, laid an axe to the root of local control and removed any power from the man on the spot, transferring it to a distant body whose local knowledge was of necessity extremely imperfect. The Home Secretary stated that quarter sessions would be an impartial tribunal. He had attended quarter sessions for thirty years, and during recent years he had had the honour of presiding over the Court; but, although he had the greatest respect for quarter sessions, he could not subscribe to the sweeping statement of the Home Secretary. Why go through the farce of asking the local justices to act at all? Why not make quarter sessions the sole authority? A more wanton insult to the local justices could not be imagined; and the public would be quite ready to lay hold of it.

SIR EDWARD GREY asked leave to withdrawn his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE moved an Amendment providing that no new licence should be granted until at least three weeks notice of the hearing of the application had been given to the local authority in the area in which the public-house was situated, and the justices had considered all representations made to them by the local authority either in writing or at the hearing of the application. His object was to give a *locus standi* to the local authority, to allow it to make a full report as to the circumstances of the case, and to make suggestions to the justices so as to assist them in coming to a conclusion with reference to the terms on which they should grant a licence. The local authority was responsible for law and order and for the expense which new licences would throw upon the district, and surely they should be able to appear before the licensing bench and express their views freely. The Solicitor-General suggested that this would be an approach to local option; but it required a very keen Celtic imagination indeed to evolve local option out of the Amendment. The local authority would probably refer the matter to a committee, which would consider all the local circumstances, and then decide as to whether a licence should be opposed or supported, and on what conditions it should be granted. He thought that quarter sessions would be rather pleased to have the assistance of the local authority. He could not see what possible objection there could be to the proposal. The late Archbishop Temple favoured it; and it was the opinion of every moderate-minded man that the local authorities should have the power to appear and express an opinion through counsel as to the granting of new licences. The Home Secretary proposed that any money obtained from new licences should go to the local taxation account; but, surely, the authority which had the expenditure of that money ought to be able to suggest to the licensing bench the payment which ought to be made. He hoped the Prime Minister would see his way to accept the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 13, after the words last omitted, to insert the words, 'provided that no new licence shall be granted until at least three weeks notice shall have been first given to the local authority for the area in which the premises are situate, and the justices have considered all representations made by such local authority, either in writing or at the hearing of the application, in respect of such application.'"—*Mr. Lloyd-George.*

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said the hon. Member desired that the local authority should have some means of saying how the money was to be made which they were to spend. That was exactly what temperance reformers on the other side of the House most vehemently objected to. Was not the Amendment, moreover, unnecessary fron the point of view of the hon. Member? He talked as if the local authority had now no right to appear before the magistrates. The law at present was, he understood, and would still remain, that "in the case of an application for a new licence any member of the public may appear before the licensing justices and oppose the grant of such licence," etc. *A fortiori* a person so much a member of the public as the representative of the local authority might do so.

Mr. ASQUITH: He cannot spend money on it.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: No, and therefore he cannot employ counsel; but surely in a matter like this that would not be the best way of dealing with a purely administrative point.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: The applicant employs counsel invariably, and so does anyone who opposes. Surely the local authority ought to have counsel.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he would have thought otherwise. The local authority must know what was going on and have full cognisance of the fact that a new licence was to be granted. They could make any proposals they liked to the magistrates. Whilst they would not gain anything by the Amendment, he thought a great deal would be lost. He did not think the general management of public affairs would be greatly improved by throwing this additional controversial subject upon their shoulders. The Amendment would do nothing which might not be done now, but it would be making a suggestion, which he would regret to see in an Act of Parliament, that part of the normal duties of a local authority should be to canvass the kind of advice they should give to the magistrates in the case of a new licence, not only as to the necessity of it, but as to the terms on which it should be granted. It would be better to leave the law as it was, allowing full liberty to all local authorities to say what they had to say to the magistrates responsible for granting new licences.

Mr. ASQUITH said he was much interested as to the little red volume from which the Prime Minister had quoted the law. The local authority had not now the power which the Amendment proposed to give them. If the local authority had, as the Prime Minister himself assumed, an interest as to the granting or withholding of a licence, surely they ought to be in a position to employ counsel and meet the other side upon equal terms. Unfortunately the House of Lords had been induced to correct the impression which formerly prevailed that local authorities were entitled to spend a modest sum out of the rates for the purpose of making their views known, and local authorities were now unable to voice the views of their constituents in that matter. He thought the Government might make a concession of that kind without in any way interfering with the general principles of their scheme.

Mr. HENDERSON (Durham, Barnard Castle) said he wished to appeal to the Government to accept the Amendment in the interests of the children of the country. Recent legislation in connection with education had put new responsibilities on the local authorities. The old school boards could only protest against the granting of new licences; but they had no power to spend money or to employ counsel. In the interests of the child life of the country it was necessary that the Amendment should be accepted.

Mr. WHITTAKER pointed out that the municipal corporations had a position in this matter somewhat different from anything which would accrue if they were made the licensing authority. Municipal corporations, through their watch committees, had control of the police, than whom nobody knew more as to the necessity or desirability of the granting or the renewal of licences; but the local authority had no power to engage legal assistance in pursuing to the Court of Appeal the opinions of their watch committees. He submitted that the watch committee, inasmuch as they had control of the police, ought to have power through the local authority to employ at the public cost legal assistance in order that the opinion of the police might be adequately expressed before the licensing authority. The Amendment was a very modest one, and he hoped the Government would accept it.

Sir JOHN GORST (Cambridge University) supported the appeal of the hon. Member for the Barnard Castle Division. A constant ground of objection to proposed sites for elementary schools was the existence of a public-house in the neighbourhood which would interfere either with the school itself or with the children attending the school. That power of objection was all very well with regard to existing public-houses, but there was nothing to prevent a new public-house being placed in a position disadvantageous to an elementary school. He submitted that it was only right that a local authority, which was charged with the duty of superintending public education, should have a voice before the magistrates in order to warn them of the evils which, from the point of view of the school, might result from the grant or the renewal of a licence.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR thought the case just brought forward was not one which required to be supported by counsel or solicitors. He was quite willing to rate as highly as the right hon. Gentleman opposite the skill of the profession of which he was so great an ornament, but it was surely enough that the members of the local authority, or the chairman on their behalf, should tell the magistrates that if a new public-house was required it must not be put down close to an elementary school. Such a case appealed to everybody, and he could not see what would be gained by the local authority being empowered to pay for such presentation to be made to the licensing magistrates. He hardly thought that such a change in the existing law was at all required to carry out the object hon. Members had in view.

Mr. LAWSON WALTON (Leeds, S.) said the Prime Minister had treated this Amendment merely as a proposal for enabling the local authorities to employ counsel, but such a view was based upon a complete misconception of the position occupied by the local authorities on these matters, and the practical steps which had been taken to give effect to their views. In the Tynemouth case, to which reference had been made, the justices had deprived six or seven houses of their licences, and the corporation decided to use public funds for the purpose of sustaining the action of the magistrates on appeal. That decision involved the employment of counsel, the collection of evidence, the engagement of a solicitor, and the payment of the costs of securing the attendance of witnesses; and while the crown of the structure might have been the counsel who ultimately adorned it, the earlier steps, which were infinitely more important, were all necessary in order to enable the local authority to make its opinion felt before the quarter sessions. The situation at present was that local authorities could not spend a single sixpence out of the rates for the purpose of conveying to the committee of quarter sessions their opinion upon matters of enormous importance to themselves. A phrase in the Amendment of the Home Secretary placed the matter on an entirely new basis, because the justices were to consider, amongst other things, "the interests of the public." How were they to know what were the interests of the public in connection with a matter with reference to which they had not necessarily any local knowledge whatever? They were being called upon to discharge an important function without having the means of ascertaining the facts. They would have a highly partisan aspect of the case presented by the applicant, but the other side would be left to the uninstructed zeal of private individuals who were opposed to the licence. It was true that members of the local authority might appear as individuals, but there was no voice of the authority as such, and no official representation was conveyed to the licensing committee to guide them in their decision. The Amendment involved no infringement of the principle of the Bill; it simply freed local authorities from the fetters placed upon their action by the decision of the House of Lords in the Tynemouth case—a decision which on public grounds could not be sustained—and he hoped the Government would grant the concession asked for.

Mr. PEMBERTON (Sunderland) joined in the appeal to the Government to accept the Amendment, which was certainly not against the principle of the Bill. It was not the case that the expression of public opinion of the district was always before the licensing authority when the question of the granting or the renewal of licences was considered. An individual might come before the licensing committee, but he came only as an individual, and naturally his views had not the same force as if he came as a representative of the local authority. One had only to think of the position before a Committee upstairs. When an individual appeared as the chairman of a public body he carried much more weight than the man who, although the chairman of a public body, appeared simply as an individual. The same argument really applied to the case they were now considering, and he therefore hoped that the Government would favourably consider the Amendment. As an attempt to meet those Members of the Party who did not see eye to eye with their leaders on the Bill the acceptance of the Amendment would be welcomed.

Mr. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam) said that on the question of expense he might remind the Committee that two years ago they enabled the licensing justices to defend their decisions on appeal at the cost of the rates. That made it no longer necessary for the local authority to duplicate that operation practically out of the same pockets. As to the contention that this Amendment was necessary in order to get the opinion of the police authority in boroughs, he knew a case where, whether legally or otherwise, the licensing justices, in their capacity as conservators of the peace, called upon the chief constable to supply all the necessary information as to the police aspects of the case. Really, as a matter of practice, with all respect to the hon. Member for Sunderland, could any man in his senses dream that it was necessary for a local authority to employ counsel in order to convey to the justices the simple fact that the resolution against the granting of a licence had been passed by the local authority? When they had conveyed that resolution what was there more?

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said this looked like an attempt to quarter the lawyers on the rates. They had already got the school board rate, the poor rate, and the police rate, and under this Amendment there would be a lawyer's rate. In his opinion there was no need whatever for the employment of any lawyer in so simple a matter as this. He must protest against this attempt to set up a tyranny of lawyers in every matter in which the public interest was concerned. Quarter sessions would be able to deal with all the representations made before them in the public interest even if they were not placed before them by a lawyer. He hoped the Solicitor-General was not going to join with his associates in making this further demand upon the rates. He trusted that this Amendment would be dismissed with the contempt which it deserved.

SIR EDWARD GREY said he trusted, on the other hand, that the Amendment would be received with the respect it deserved. He hoped the hon. Member for King's Lynn would welcome his intervention, for whatever other faults or qualities he might have, he was not a lawyer. It was the Prime Minister who had stumbled upon the legal point. The right hon. Gentleman had taken up a red book written, he believed, by a lawyer, and had been misled by that book apparently. The Prime Minister used two arguments against the Amendment. The first was that local authorities could already do under the law what it had been clearly proved they could not do. That argument therefore fell to the ground. The other argument was that, even if they could, it was undesirable that they should busy themselves with this very contentious matter of licensing. He thought that local authorities could not be kept free from contentious matters of this kind. Very often, indeed, the more contentious the matter the more necessary it was that they should be introduced into it. It would have been more useful if, instead of the red book, the right hon. Gentleman had had in his hand the Liquor Licensing Ordinance applied to the Transvaal. There the right hon. Gentleman would find that upon this question of the sale of liquor by retail, control was given by a vote of the majority of the voters, or, in their absence, to a majority of the white male population over twenty-one years of age, residing within the village or ward. When they heard of the thin end of the wedge for local option being introduced by this Amendment surely that argument was a little late in the day, more especially after the Government had gone so far in regard to a community in the Transvaal, in a backward state as regarded representative institutions. He thought the Prime Minister ought to feel that he owed the Opposition a concession. The right hon. Gentleman charged them with inconsistency because he had been bombarded with representations not to interfere with the discretion of the justices. Now that he had fettered the discretion of the justices he thought the right hon. Gentleman might give them some compensation by bringing in the popular element to the extent of enabling representative bodies to advise the justices. The Bill said that the licensing authority should consider the public interest. Surely those words contained the logical conclusion that a representative authority should have the right to offer such advice or make such representations as they thought fit.

MR. BUTCHER (York) said that in this matter of new licences it had been said that the public interest could not be properly represented unless counsel or solicitors were employed by the local authority.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said his Amendment provided that notice should be given to the local authority before the hearing of applications for new licences, and it provided that magistrates must hear the representatives of the local authorities.

MR. BUTCHER said it had been pointed out that every member of the local authority was entitled to go before quarter sessions with all the authority he possessed as a member of that local authority, and this was not disputed.

Mr. LAWSON WALTON: As I understand the law, they cannot appear officially.

Mr. BUTCHER said they could appear as members of the public, and he should be very much surprised if their authority was diminished at all, because they were members of a public authority. On the contrary, it seems to him that their authority would be very much increased when it was known that they were members of the authority. Proceeding, the hon. Member said he knew no reason why the chairman of a local authority should not be authorised by resolution of his board to appear before quarter sessions and state their views authoritatively on his own behalf and on behalf of his council; and he should be astonished to hear that quarter sessions would refuse to hear him. It had been argued that this was not sufficient, and that it was necessary to appear by counsel or solicitor; but if laymen appearing before quarter sessions showed half the ability many laymen in that House had shown they would do extremely well. If there was a general feeling that the local authority ought to collect evidence, it would be necessary to allow them to go to a certain amount of expense. In the present state of the law the cost of putting quarter sessions in full possession of the facts of the case could not be got out of the public rates. If there was a general feeling in the House that in order to collect evidence it was necessary that the local authority should go to a certain amount of expense, and if it were a fact that at present that expense could not be paid for out of the rates, then he hoped that the Government would at a later stage of the Bill take this matter into consideration.

Mr. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.) said an appeal had been made to the Government by the hon. Member for York, who was regarded as the author of this Bill——

Mr. BUTCHER: I do not claim any such distinction.

Mr. YOXALL said he could not help thinking that if the Prime Minister were

present he would, after hearing the views of the hon. Member for York, have yielded on this particular point. A great feature of the debates had been that, when the Solicitor-General had exercised his great knowledge and ability and was evidently in a mood to concede something, he had been unable to make that concession because of the furtive and temporary appearances of the Prime Minister. So now the Solicitor-General was to be overridden by the Prime Minister. The Amendment generally commended itself to the whole Committee. The Government had brought into existence all over the country local authorities for education. It was part of the duty of these authorities, when any private enterprise in the neighbourhood of their schools was likely to be injurious to those schools, to protest against it, but the chairman of the local authority could not go before the licensing justices in his official capacity, and make a representation against a licence being given to a house near a school, which, in the view of the authority, would be prejudicial. There was no doubt that the local authority should be given such power, and he hoped the Government would take that view.

Sir EDWARD CARSON said he did not think he was open to the particular charge the hon. Member had made against him, because before the Prime Minister spoke he had expressed the opinion that this Amendment, as drawn, would not enable the local authority to defray costs out of the rates. But the Amendment was intended to serve an entirely different purpose. It had been pointed out over and over again that any member of the public could go before the justices. The whole of the local authority could appear in a body, wearing their robes if they had any, and express their views before the justices. They could pass resolutions and forward them to the justices. They could hold meetings and publish the resolutions passed there, and the justices would know them just as well as if the members of the local authority appeared in their official capacity. This was not a question of the employment or the non-employment of counsel. What this Amendment sought was to give the local authority a statutory right to interfere at the investigation of licensing cases. The hon. Baronet had said that there was no question of interference. But there was a question of interference, and he would tell the Committee why. What would be the effect if the treatment of a particular case entered into politics at local elections? Could anybody maintain that such a proceeding would not conflict with the administration of the law by the local justices? Everybody must know that an immediate conflict would arise, and that it would become an acute question of politics in the neighbourhood. They would go further and say that the local justices were not representative of the people, not elected by the people, and that they were absolutely overriding what had been thoroughly investigated before the electors at the election. Whether it would be a good system to allow the local authorities to administer the clause instead of allowing the justices to do so, was a question that might be argued, but he hoped the Committee would not pass this Amendment with the idea that it only involved the collection of evidence. The Amendment would set up in the licensing districts the power of the local authority as against the power of the justices.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH (Anglesey) said the Solicitor-General was under a misapprehension as to the case made on the Opposition side. They were accustomed to sympathetic consideration of Amendments from the hon. and learned Gentleman, but on this occasion he had departed from that rule. He understood the Solicitor-General to say, Why not go there as individuals? If it was just as powerful for officials to go in their individual capacity, why that strong tirade at the end of his speech? He submitted that there ought to be authority of some kind given to local authorities to go before the justices. It had been a complaint for many years past that if there was opposition to a licence it was left to private individuals, and it very often happened that what was everyone's duty was no one's duty. In that way the temperance party had had to contend against a powerful trade. It was not reasonable that where a local authority took a view on a matter of this kind, they should not be allowed to state that view in an official way. This was not a question of employing counsel. The local authority must judge of the necessity of that in each particular case. He noticed that the Bill provided that the brewers might be represented by counsel at quarter sessions. It should be remembered that at present the licensing justices could be represented by counsel at quarter sessions; but as he understood, that would not happen under the Bill, because it was the licensing justices' report that was to be considered by quarter sessions. He must say that the opposition of the Government to this Amendment showed once more their preference of the interests of the brewers to the interests of the public, so far as this Bill was concerned. His hon. friend the Member for Carnarvon had referred to the old cricketer playing the game, while the gate-money went to the brewers. As the game was going on the brewers were the umpires, because it was for them to say whether the Government were to be in or out. It was because the umpires would not allow them to accept this Amendment that the Solicitor-General had hardened his heart.

MR. RITCHIE (Croydon) said he did not think that the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken was justified in adopting such a tone. He wished to express his regret that the Government had not seen their way to accept, at any rate, the principle of the Amendment, which he considered to be eminently reasonable. There was no question of the local authority being brought in to deal with anything in the nature of a vested interest; but he could not conceive of anything more proper than that the local authority should have a voice in the question whether a new interest should be created. Indeed he did not understand the Government to deny that the local authority were, or ought to be, charged with certain responsibility in this matter, because the hon. and learned Gentleman said that any member of the local authority might appear before the justices. If it were true that the local authority had or ought to have an interest in these matters, it could not be wrong that they should have some means for putting forward the views that they held. He could not conceive why, when a new licence was proposed to be created, the local authority, which was responsible for good order and conduct in the locality, should not have the means of putting their views before the licensing authorities. He could not but think that the Government might reconsider the question. A Government lost nothing by being reasonable upon Amendments which were not in themselves vital, but which did commend themselves to a very considerable number of Members. He would suggest to his right hon. and learned friend that he might at least say that on this matter the Government were prepared to keep an open mind, even if they could not accept this particular Amendment. It was a very general feeling in the House that local authorities should have the power to put their views or objections before the licensing authorities.

Mr. BRYN ROBERTS (Carnarvonshire, Eifion) said he thought it would be extremely desirable if the question of granting licences was taken out of the hands of the justices and put into the hands of some public authority. He thought that the brewers themselves would be rather in favour of this Amendment, because they complained that any teetotaler was able to oppose the renewal or the grant of a licence. Down to 1894 any person could enforce a right to a public footpath at his own expense, but no public authority had the right to expend public money for that purpose. The power, however, was given in the Act of 1894. The result was that if there was any question of defending footpaths, it was taken in hand by the district council or the county council. and private persons had practically abandoned their rights. He thought it would be very desirable that the same course should be followed in regard to licences. He thought that any Amendment which tended to take opposition to applications for licences out of private hands and put it on the public authority should be adopted.

*Mr. MARSHALL HALL (Lancashire, Southport) said he thought that this was an Amendment which the Government ought to allow. The local authority ought to have some right to appear at quarter sessions on the question whether these licences were to be granted or not, and it would be far better that they should be able to appear in their representative capacity. He thought, however, that there ought to be some provision to protect the views of the minority, in the event of the local authority being against a licence by a bare majority. What was wanted was some opportunity of showing what was the real feeling of the local authority on the matter.

Mr. LLOYD WHARTON said he would like to know what the local authority was which was referred to in the Amendment. Was it the parish council, or the district council, or the county council? He had heard of a parish council which consisted of two members. If it was a district council, its chairman, who was a county magistrate, would represent its views; and if it was the county council the clerk of the peace would represent it. He did not see what more was needed or why counsel should be employed.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 178; Noes, 262. (Division List No. 223.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Asher, Alexander
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellice, Capt. E. C. (SAndrw'sBghs

Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Fran. H. (Maidstone
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone, Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gorst, Rt. Hon.Sir John Eldon
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E.(Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hain, Edward
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale
Harwood, George
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, RtHn.H.(Somers't E
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David Brynmor(Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent P.(Cavan, W.
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (Accrington)
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt.Hn. John(Montrose
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parrott, William
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, J. Lawson (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh., N.)
Woodhouse, Sir J.T(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Charles Morley and Mr. Pemberton.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Aird, Sir John
Allhusen, Augustus HenryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hn. Sir H.
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt.Hon. A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T.(Windsor)
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, T. Gibson(King'sLynn)
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt.Hn.J.A.(Glasgow
Campbell, J.H.M.(DublinUniv.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn.J.A(Worc.
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herbert Shepherd(Bolton
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D.(Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale, Rt.Hon.Sir JosephC.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph

Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants., W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Mancr.
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Gordon, Maj. E. (T'r Hamlets)
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hardy, Lawrence (Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, Jn. (Kent, Faversham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Kerr, John
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks., N.R.
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh, W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, Rt Hn. Sir H. E (Wigt'n
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.)
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell, William (Burnley)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir Harry S. (Limehouse
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, H. C. (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ.
Thompson, Dr E. C (Monagh'n, N
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H (Sheffield
Walker, Col. William Hall
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

*MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS said that at an earlier period of the afternoon he explained the reason for putting down the Amendment to Sub-section 1, and in stating the reasons for putting down these new clauses he need only add a few words to what he said then. The provisions he now proposed in place of Sub-section 2 were really to explain the provisions of the Bill. The licensing justices were given power to grant new licences, subject to any reasonable conditions. It was further suggested the licences might be granted at the discretion of the licensing justices for any period not exceeding seven years. During that period the licences would not be subject to renewal, but at the end of seven years they would again be treated as new licences, and the conditions under which the justices originally granted them would apply. The reason for giving the justices this power was that these new licences would not come under the compensation clauses of the Bill, and therefore it was desirable that they should be granted in this form, in order that a substantial tenant might be obtained. There was no obligation on the part of the justices to grant a licence for the full seven years; they could grant a licence for any period not exceeding the term; or they need not make use of this method at all. As those licences when granted would not require renewal, or come under the supervision of the licensing justices every year, provision had been made for enforcing the conditions under which they were granted. A Court of summary jurisdiction would have the power of forfeiture if the licensee did not observe the conditions, and in that way the proper observance of the conditions under which the licence was granted was assured. Having excluded those new licences from the operation of the compensation fund, it had been necessary to find a fund into which any money derived from the higher payments in respect of the licences should be placed, and the Government, therefore, had arrived at the conclusion that that money should be transferred and used in a similar way to those funds, which under Section 20 of the Local Government Act, 1888, were transferred to the Local Taxation Fund and used in the relief of rates. The object was to secure to the justices in the granting of new licences power to insist upon reasonable conditions, and to ensure that they should take particular care that no new monopoly value was created. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

'In page 3, line 14, to leave out Sub-section (2) and insert—

'(2) The justices of a licensing district on the grant of a new licence may attach to the grant of the licence such conditions, both as to the payments to be made and the tenure of the licence, and as to any other matters, as they think proper in the interests of the public, and shall attach such conditions as they think best adapted for preventing any private person from obtaining any benefit from any monopoly value of the licence.

'(3) For the purposes of this section a new on-licence may be granted for a term not exceeding seven years, and where a licence is so granted for a term, any application for a re-grant of the licence on the expiration of the term shall be treated as an application for the grant of a new licence, not as an application for the renewal of a licence, and during the continuance of the term the licence shall not require renewal.

'(4) The amount of any payments made in pursuance of any conditions under this section shall be collected and dealt with in the same manner as the duties on local taxation licences within the meaning of Section 20 of the Local Government Act, 1888.

'(5) A licence granted for a term under this section may (without prejudice to any other provisions as to forfeiture) be forfeited, if any condition imposed under this section is not complied with, by order of a Court of summary jurisdiction made on complaint, or if the holder of the licence is convicted of any offence committed by him, as such, by the Court by whom he is convicted; but where a licence is so forfeited the owner of the licensed premises shall have all the rights conferred on owners by Section 15 of the Licensing Act, 1874.' "—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question proposed, "That Sub-section (2) stand part of the clause."

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) asked whether this new proposal ought not to have originated in Committee of the Whole House. It was in fact a proposal to increase the licence duties, and on the Finance Bill the Chairman had ruled that such a proposal required origination in Committee of the Whole House. The only differences in the present proposal were that the burden was to be imposed by the magistrates, that it was optional, and that it applied only to new licences. Unless those slight differences were held to alter the principle, he submitted that the ruling to which he had referred applied to the proposal now before the Committee.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I am relieved from the necessity of making any original pronouncement on the matter, as the question has already been brought before the notice of Mr. Speaker, who, after full consideration, has ruled that no Committee was necessary.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: On this Amendment?

*THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. I may say that I had come to the same conclusion, because this charge is levied not Imperially but locally. It goes to local purposes, and it need not even be levied at all. But it is unnecessary for me to go into reasons, because Mr. Speaker has already ruled on the subject.

SIR ROBERT REID: Will it be competent for any private Member to move to increase the licence duties proposed by this clause?

*THE CHAIRMAN: The clause gives the fullest latitude. The justices are to be given power to fix "any such sum"; they may fix £1,000,000 for each licence if they choose.

SIR ROBERT REID: Are we at liberty to propose that the full amount be imposed, instead of leaving the amount at the option of the justices?

*THE CHAIRMAN: I do not understand what the hon. and learned Member means by "the full amount." If the justices think fit to impose the condition that for every new licence £1,000,000 should be paid, they will be able to do so.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I take it, then, the Amendment of my hon. and learned friend to impose 4 per cent., and so on, will be perfectly in order?

*THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, but that would probably be limiting the discretion of the justices.

SIR ROBERT REID: Then it would be in order.

MR. CRIPPS (Lancashire, Stretford) said that in his opinion the present proposals of the Home Secretary met the real difficulties of the licensing question much less satisfactorily than the original proposals of the Bill, and there were two or three points on which he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would enlighten the Committee before they went into the details of the question. Under the Bill the terms to be imposed on the granting of new licences were placed in the discretion of quarter sessions. They were now to be placed in the discretion of the authority for the particular licensing district in which the licence was applied for. That, he thought, was a great mistake. It ought not to be possible for different conditions to be imposed in each licensing district of a county; unless the same conditions applied throughout the county at large the administration of the law would be rendered exceedingly difficult. For instance, if the licensing authority in any particular district imposed conditions which quarter sessions thought to be not in the public interest, quarter sessions would have the power to refuse the new licence on that ground, but not to impose such conditions as they thought right and proper. Was that really a practicable method of dealing with the question? It was a serious question, because it might lead to a complete deadlock. If quarter sessions thought the conditions imposed were unsatisfactory, when the licence came up for confirmation they ought to deal with the whole subject-matter, and decide not merely whether they should refuse the licence on the ground that the conditions were unsatisfactory, but also whether they themselves should not impose conditions which they thought were in the public interest. Were the hands of quarter sessions to be tied by this power being withheld? The responsibility for confirmation rested, in the last resort, not with the licensing district but with quarter sessions, and they could not exercise that authority without full powers being given to them.

The second proposition was much more serious. He understood that in future new licences were practically to be put up to auction and sold to the highest bidder. He did not think that would be in the public interest and they ought not to deal with new licences in that way. There were much larger interests involved, and they ought to grant new licences under the best conditions and to the best applicants whether they were prepared to pay the highest price or not. Instead of having the power to deal with licences from year to year as regarded ill-conduct and disciplinary powers, which were so important and which had worked so admirably in regard to the licensing laws in the past, all those powers were now to be taken away. They proposed to put new licences up to auction and then give the purchaser a seven years term during which he was not to be interfered with however much the local magistrates might think it desirable to interfere. It had been suggested as regarded these licences that they ought to see that the persons who applied for them did not get a monopoly value. He quite agreed with that, but that was an entirely different matter from putting the licences up to auction, a proceeding which might be exercised to the detriment of true temperance reform. He hoped that no principle of that kind would be introduced into this Bill. This was not a matter of sale and purchase, but a matter of the public interest. There ought to be the same annual power to deal with them as at present and he was not prepared to tie the hands of the magistrates for seven years and take away their disciplinary powers. The proposal of the Home Secretary provided—

> "(2) The justices of a licensing district on the grant of a new licence may attach to the grant of the licence such conditions, both as to the payments to be made and the tenure of the licence, and as to any other matters, as they think proper in the interests of the public, and shall attach such conditions as they think best adapted for preventing any private person from obtaining any benefit from any monopoly value of the licence."

It was difficult to know exactly what that meant, but he thought its effect would be thac a person who in the ordinary way would be willing to invest money would not be willing, under those rules, to erect the class of public-house wanted. How could they expect any man to do that if he was not going to get a profit? It meant that they would drive out of the competition the best class of men, and would practically compel people to erect in the future houses of a less efficient type, or else reintroduce the very class of house they all wanted to get rid of. This difficulty was all owing to the absurd notion of seeking to introduce so great a matter as State regulation. By adopting this system they would defeat their own ends, and drive away the people they ought to encourage, for he could not imagine anyone building good public-houses under those conditions, because at the end of seven years the purchaser might be dispossessed and have to pay again. Could they conceive anyone investing money to build public-houses or rebuilding them so as to be satisfactory from the hotel or saloon point of view under such conditions? Every new licence in the future would come under these terms and the old law would be altered from top to bottom and altered in the wrong direction. Was it important to introduce the best article and to provide the best premises? Was it important to have the business carried on so as to have the best social conditions? He considered that the terms of this Amendment so far from conducing to a higher level of our licensing system in the future would tend entirely to have a contrary effect. The Amendment would tend to reduce the system to a level which they would all regret. If the present licence duty was not sufficient that was a matter for the House to consider, but to put a particular licence up to auction, and to put every obstacle in the way of a house being well-conducted, would, he thought, interfere to a most serious extent with the proper management of the house. That was not the proper way to conduce to temperance reform, and he sincerely hoped that some Amendment would be introduced which would not revolutionise our licensing system in the future as was proposed by the Amendment of the Home Secretary.

Sir ROBERT REID said he agreed with one observation of the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite, namely, that it was not possible to adequately discuss this new system in the limited time allowed. He thought the Amendment a very great improvement on the original proposals of the Government, and in default of a better he would support it. Annual licences had hitherto been granted, and all that law, justice, and the statutes could do had been done to express the undoubted rule that they were subject to be discontinued at the end of every year. That could not be made clearer than it already was. That system had broken down, or, at least, so far that the Government and a majority of this House had thought themselves bound to confer property and a freehold tenure on those who held licences. The moral originating from this consideration was that a person was not likely to invest money on an annual tenure on account of its being so short. It was contended that if the period were longer what was called the equity or expectation would not arise, at all events in so strong a form, especially as it was said in the Amendment that after seven years it was to be treated as an application for a new licence, and not an application for a renewal. The point, therefore, was that when the seven years tenure had come to an end the licence was not to last longer. He thought words should be put in to say that at the end of seven years the licence would not be continued unless public necessity required that it should be renewed. He did not know that that was not implied. He did not think the Amendment was open to the strictures of the hon. and learned Gentleman.

*MR. PEEL (Manchester, S.) said the points dealt with by the hon. and learned Gentleman on that side of the House were whether all these conditions were only to be applied by the licensing session, and whether quarter sessions, when the matter came before them for confirmation, should have some power of altering the conditions or whether the question ought to be: Shall we grant this licence or not? In regard to the first point he thought there was a very great deal to be said for it. Conditions might be inserted for bringing the general administration in the different licensing quarters in a county into some kind of similarity. On the next point he could not help feeling that the hon. and learned Gentleman had to some extent exaggerated the words that were placed in the clause when he said that the putting up of a licence to the highest bidder would be an extremely bad thing for the general public. Hon. Members on the Opposition side had been contending that too much power was placed in the hands of brewers and brewery companies. It seemed to him that the conditions now proposed were so severe that small men would not be got to put money into licensed houses. It would only be possible for the large brewer or brewery company to get the licence, and it would be acquired in some cases not for the purpose of getting money out of it but to prevent other parties from getting the licence. In that way the proposal might not work to the best advantage. He was not sure that his hon. and learned friend had attached sufficient importance to some of the other words in the Amendment.

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

LICENSING BILL [3RD ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 4:—

Amendment again proposed—

"In page 3, line 14, to leave out Sub-section (2), and insert the words—

'(2) The justices of a licensing district on the grant of a new licence may attach to the grant of the licence such conditions, both as to the payments to be made and the tenure of the licence, and as to any other matters, as they think proper in the interests of the public, and shall attach such conditions as they think best adapted for preventing any private person from obtaining any benefit from any monopoly value of the licence.

'(3) For the purposes of this section a new on-licence may be granted for a term not exceeding seven years, and where a licence is so granted for a term any application for a regrant of the licence on the expiration of the term shall be treated as an application for the grant of a new licence, not as an application for the renewal of a licence, and during the continuance of the term the licence shall not require renewal.

'(4) The amount of any payments made in pursuance of any conditions under this section shall be collected and dealt with in the same manner as the duties on local taxation licences within the meaning of Section 20 of the Local Government Act, 1888.

'(5) A licence granted for a term under this section may (without prejudice to any other provisions as to forfeiture) be forfeited, if any condition imposed under this section is not complied with, by order of a Court of summary jurisdiction made on complaint, or if the holder of the licence is convicted of any offence committed by him as such, by the Court by whom he is convicted, but where a licence is so forfeited the owner of the licensed premises shall have all the rights conferred on owners by Section 15 of the Licensing Act, 1874.' "—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question again proposed, "That Subsection (2) stand part of the clause."

*MR. PEEL, continuing his speech, said whatever view the Committee might hold on this particular Amendment everybody must agree that it was of very great importance. It established an entirely new principle of licensing, and he could not but regret that the discussion upon it had not commenced earlier in the afternoon, and that so much time had been absorbed in the discussion of other Amendments, which however useful they might be, were not comparable with this in importance. The diminution of the powers of the magistrates under this Bill had been referred to; it had been, in fact, made the football of the debate throughout these discussions. There, however, could be no doubt that in one respect the powers of the magistrates were diminished if licences were granted for a longer period than one year; but that power was purely optional. The magistrates could grant these licences for any time they liked up to a period of seven years. Looked at from another point of view the powers of the magistrates were greatly enhanced in the direction of imposing conditions and money payments. Those who complained of the diminution of the power of the licensing magistrates had not taken into consideration the position the holders of these licences would be in if a clause of this kind were not passed. By the general assent of the House these new licences were to be exempted from the contribution and compensation clause, and therefore the licence-holders would be in exactly the same position as they were previous to this Bill being introduced. They would have the liability of having the licence taken away every year, but on the other hand the knowledge that they would get a renewal of the licence every year subject to good conduct. Therefore, in discussing the diminution of power, they had to compare it not with the freedom enjoyed under this Bill, but with the freedom possessed in the years preceding the introduction of it. With regard to the monopoly value, he thought it would be a most difficult thing to make any calculation as to what the monopoly value was. It must always be a pure speculation, as it would be impossible to say what would be the profit of a particular house in seven years. But the magistrates might impose as a condition a money payment—not at the commencement of the granting of the licences, but the payment of a certain percentage on the profits on the principle of the gold tax in the Transvaal every year; and inasmuch as the monopoly value must be a purely hypothetical value that would, in his opinion, be the wisest course to adopt. The only weakness in the proposal was, that, having to pay a considerable sum as monopoly value, the owner would make much less money out of the licence, and at the end of the seven years the magistrates, in consideration of that fact, might be apt to say, "We will continue this man's licence for another seven years," and so something approaching a vested interest would again grow up.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said it appeared to him a most remarkable thing that a great financial Resolution such as this could be accomplished in the simple way in which this had been brought about. He did not challenge the Amendment. It meant the introduction of high licence duties into this country. For nineteen years he had stood almost alone in advocating high licence duties, and now the Government of the day had been converted to them. Nothing would induce him to vote against the Amendment, which was the one great financial provision in the Bill. But this scheme involved three distinct categories of licence duties—first of all, the duties imposed by the Act of 1880; then the additional payments imposed for the purpose of compensation; and finally the duties created under this Amendment. He did not see any representatives of the Treasury on the Benches opposite although this was a Treasury Bill. He believed that the time would come when all these payments would be merged in one, and that the financial system of the licence duties would demand simplification. The present scheme involved a financial confusion which no self-respecting Chancellor of the Exchequer would tolerate for a moment. What would the result be? There would be two kinds of licences. A licence under the the old Act of 1880, by which the licensee was compelled to give up a fractional part of its monopoly value. Side by side with that a totally new set of licences were brought into existence, which were to be taxed up to the hilt as regarded monopoly value. How could such a discrimination between the old and new licences be justified? It seemed to him incredible that anyone could expect such a system to last. The brewers had a vested interest in the Tory Party being retained in office, although it appeared to him to be a vanishing security. He welcomed the proposal now before the Committee, because it was the beginning of the end, and because it introduced the principle of high licence.

Mr. DUKE (Plymouth) said his views in regard to licensing were not so revolutionary as those of the hon. and learned Gentleman who had just sat down, but he agreed with him in welcoming the principle of the scheme, because it was a new departure. Anyone who regarded the public well-being would agree that they were too much fetterred by what their forefathers had done, and by conventions in regard to the liquor traffic. They on that side of the House disagreed with hon. Gentlemen opposite as to the mode by which the difficulties of the licensing question could be got rid of. They, on that side, believed that the rights of property which had grown up by reason of the action of their predecessors should not be disregarded. They were entitled with regard to new licences, however, to make new conditions, because conditions that were the subject of free bargain between the licence-holder and the community could not possibly inflict any hardship on the individual. When a bargain was made for a fixed term, there was no claim either moral or equitable at the expiry of the term for a renewal of the bargain. The monopoly of the sale of liquor, if resting on proper grounds, must be a monopoly for the public benefit. The Amendment was in some parts ambiguous, and he suggested the adoption of phraseology which would make it perfectly clear that the public were parting for a term of years with a monopoly right, which was for the future, in respect of new licences, to be a public right. It was suggested that if the justices in licensing districts in the counties were to set up separate conditions, there might be difficulty in dealing with the matter. Perhaps, however, if there was a common understanding in the House as to the desirability of a scheme of this kind, the Home Secretary might propose words which would ensure something like uniformity in the county area. He gave his hearty support to the principle of the Amendment.

Mr. DISRAELI (Cheshire, Altrincham) said he considered this clause was hardly adequate to deal with the object which it was intended to effect. The clause would affect the whole future licensing system of the country. He must say that the Government need not at the last moment have made so large a change in the procedure prescribed by the Bill in Clause 4. He did not want to find fault with the Bill; he thought it was a very good Bill; but it was now proposed, without any previous notice, to do away with the power of the magistrates in quarter sessions to make a county scheme for new licences. That power was to be given to petty sessions. There might be eight or nine petty sessional divisions in a county, and if each had their own regulations that must lead to confusion. He ventured to think that in altering the scheme from quarter to petty sessions it would put it out of the power of the magistrates to make a cohesive county scheme for dealing with new licences. He looked with alarm on the procedure by which new licences were to be granted on a seven years lease. Of course he might be told that great freedom would be given to the magistrates; but they might only give a lease for one or two years. The plan, he thought, would discourage the building of good houses, and would tend to increase the number of those mean public-houses in back streets, where so much drunkenness took place. It would also be unfortunate if licence-holders were relieved from the obligation of appearing annually before the magistrates and hearing what they had to say on matters affecting the trade. The effect of putting up licences to auction would be that nobody but large brewers would be able to obtain them. He very much regretted that he could not support the Amendment.

MR. AINSWORTH (Argyllshire) said it must be evident to hon. Members on both sides that this Bill marked a revolution in the licensing system of the country. They had been discussing how licences were to be managed, but he wondered whether hon. Members had asked themselves the question why a licence was ever granted? It was not for the benefit of the revenue, for that was comparatively insignificant; it was not granted for the benefit of the licence-holder or the large firm behind him. No; the licence was granted in the interest of the public and that was the reason why up to now no licence had ever been sold for money. Under the old system the wants of the neighbourhood were watched; but now that was to be done away with and the business was to be left to an authority sitting perhaps miles away. Having destroyed the system of local control the Government had now come to the point of saying, well, if the new licensing authority is to issue licences let it be to the highest bidder. In an hour and ten minutes this revolution would become law—they would have revolutionised the licensing system of the country. They were dealing in a hurry with the legal interests of the country; whether the holders of new licences had to pay any price at all had to be decided, but it should be decided with a view to the total revenue of the country and without regard to any accidental requirements of the local authorities.

*SIR PHILIP MUNTZ (Warwickshire, Tamworth) said that the Amendment would make a revolution in our licensing system. In his opinion instead of improving the class of houses and the class of tenants the new clause was calculated to deteriorate both. He failed to understand why the Opposition, who were opposed to tied houses, supported the proposal, because, speaking from a practical knowledge of the question extending over forty years, he could say that the whole of the new licences would pass into the hands of the brewers. He objected to licences being granted for a period of seven years without the annual approval of magistrates. The new system was unsound because under it they would not get the best class of tenant, but the man with the most money or the great brewer. At the end of the seven years the licence was to be again put up for auction, and if it was worth anything the great brewer would again step in. That would perpetuate the system of tied houses. He could not help feeling that the proposal was wrong. It required complete reconsideration and revision in order that another system might be introduced securing the best class of houses, and that no licence should be granted until there had been the most careful consideration by the magistrates at quarter sessions or petty sessions of the question whether the licence was required for the district. When it was determined that the licence should be granted it should only be granted to a house of the highest and best type, affording every accommodation, and to a man who would occupy it and who was in every way qualified by the highest character for the position. What guarantee was there that under this proposal they would secure a respectable licensee, if he knew that his occupation would only last for seven years. This was the worst system they could devise. The clause as it stood was unwise, unsound, and was based neither on the interests of the licensed trade or of those of temperance reform. He appealed to the Prime Minister to withdraw the clause and submit another in its place securing the objects he had suggested.

*MR. LAWSON WALTON said the hon. Member who had just spoken based his criticism of this Amendment on his distrust of the licensing authority. Every one of his arguments assumed that the magisterial bench of which he had had forty years experience would not deal wisely and in a judicial spirit with the jurisdiction vested in them under this Bill. The Amendment, which he thought was an admirable Amendment, proposed to give to the justices of the licensing district power which they did not now possess.

*SIR PHILIP MUNTZ: I said that in my opinion the magistrates had dealt wisely in the past with licensing questions and would do so in the future.

*MR. LAWSON WALTON said if that were the opinion of the hon. Member he was entirely at a loss to understand the feeling of apprehension with which he regarded an extension of the magistrates' powers. As he understood the hon. Member the power to impose conditions given under this Amendment would not be wisely exercised, and that so far from seeking the most eligible applicant the magistrates would be guided solely by financial considerations and would chose the highest bidder whether he were the best qualified or not. He asked the Committee to conclude that the justices would act wisely in the future. No argument whatever had been used against this jurisdiction being given to them. The magistrates would have ample power to clothe the granting of licences with any conditions they might choose to demand in the interests of the public, which by this Amendment they were expressly enjoined to consider. The attachment of some financial terms to the granting of a most valuable monopoly right was by no means inconsistent with the general policy of our licensing law. It was not an impossibility to choose the most eligible applicant and at the same time to recognise that they were conferring upon him a financial endowment in regard to which he might be fairly asked to make some contribution which would, to some extent, relieve the local burdens of the district. The hon. and learned Member for the Stretford Division was rather opposed to the provision under which it would be possible to have different conditions obtaining in different districts. But if they were to have experiments they must leave the magisterial discretion unfettered. If there magisterial Court was to be trusted, their was no reason why its discretion should be restricted.

There was another part of the Amendment which appeared to him more important, and that was the introduction of a system which he could not help thinking would ultimately be the licensing system in this country, viz., the power—which he wished was compulsory—to licensing justices to grant a seven years licence in place of the annual grant. No one who had considered this question could have avoided coming to the conclusion that the annual licence was an obsolete and inapplicable system. At present, when an application for a new licence was made, the justices asked to inspect the plans; plans involving expenditure possibly of thousands of pounds were submitted; they were inspected and passed, the house was constructed under the supervision of the Bench, and the licence was granted when the house was completed. But although it was obvious that many years must elapse before the capital expenditure was exhausted, the term of the licence was one year only. That was an obsolete system, totally inapplicable to modern conditions. If they were dealing solely with new licences, he did not think there could be the smallest question that the one year was doomed, and that they must give either an equity of renewal or a tenure of licence which would enable the person who obtained the licence to look forward to a definite period during which he would have some security for the capital he had invested. The problem in regard to new licences was so simple that the Government had been persuaded by the force of argument, and had provided under this Amendment that new licences should be for seven years, and that when that seven years had elapsed the licence would be enewed for another seven years. That system entirely removed the necessity for any compensation. The proposal under this section gave no compensation after the lapse of seven years, and when those seven years had elapsed there might be a review by the Bench of the whole situation of the district and its needs with regard to the trade.

If this argument was so sound that it had convinced the Government with regard to new licensing, was there no means by which the system might be applied to existing licences. If it was so sound that every new licence was to be granted on the footing of a lease of seven years, during which the tenant might count his risk of non-renewal at the end of that period, insure against loss, and limit the expenditure of his capital to the duration of his term—why should they not adapt that system, at once businesslike and logical, to the existing licences. Such a proposal he had himself made the subject of a new clause, which, however, would meet the fate of many other suggestions under the closure. How might that system be applied to licences now in existence? If the licensee were allowed to have the option of taking the renewal for seven years instead of one, of abstaining entirely from any contribution to the fund, and of keeping out of the scope of the scheme of compensation, he might be given the power of putting himself into the same category as the new licensees. He would become his own insurer. He might insure on better terms than this Bill provided and he would have all the advantages which a new licensee possessed under this clause. What was the objection to that system? He would gladly support the Amendment, which, if it could be carried one step further so as to bridge the chasm between new licences and old licences and obviate the absurd anomaly of having two classes of licences, would make then the Bill a statesmanlike measure.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that, though the form of this clause was new, it was the fact that from the first moment the Bill was introduced he had always explained to the House that, in the view of his colleagues, and in his own view, it was an essential part of their scheme that as regarded new licences, where existing rights were in no sense involved, a new system should be adopted. The hon. Member appealed to their sympathies because he could not bring on his own Amendment, but although they could not have the hon. and learned Gentleman's Amendment they were delighted to have had his speech. They only regretted that it was not made on the First or Second Reading.

MR. WHITTAKER said this provision was not before the House then.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the Bill was before the House, and what he was dropping a sympathetic tear over was that the hon. and learned Gentleman did not deliver his speech on the First or Second Reading or on some subsequent occasion when the fundamental principles of the Bill were under discussion. For he had said that the system of annual licences was antiquated and obsolete, that it was not appropriate to the present condition of affairs, and that there ought to be either an equity of renewal or a lease. Where was "Sharpe *v.* Wakefield"?

***MR. LAWSON WALTON** said he was indicating a perfect system. "Sharpe *v.* Wakefield" defined the existing law which was most imperfect.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the argument of the hon. and learned Gentleman on the Second Reading would have been most highly valued. The hon. Gentleman behind him, not content with "Sharpe *v.* Wakefield," went back to the 16th century to show that annual licences were the proper system, and the idea that there was a right to an equity of renewal or a lease would have been received earlier in the debate by the hon. and learned Gentleman's friend with shouts of disapproval. If the hon. and learned Gentleman voted against the First and Second Reading, holding the ideas he did on the equity of renewal or right to a lease, it was impossible to square his votes with the view which, with so much eloquence and acumen, he had now expounded to the Committee.

***MR. LAWSON WALTON** pointed out that his argument referred to new licences. Where a house was constructed under the sanction of the Bench in the anticipation of an annual grant, there should be either an equity of renewal or a fixed term during which the tenant might provide against his capital being unexhausted. He was not dealing with old licences under the present system under which there had been so many warnings of the precarious character of their tenure, of which warnings "Sharpe *v.* Wakefield" was the most pointed.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR did not follow the hon. and learned Gentleman. Many structural alterations had been required from men holding their licences on an annual tenure. The Government said it was an outrage to take the licence away without compensation. The hon. and learned Gentleman apparently thought it an outrage, but he had been voting steadily against the Bill, the object of which was to prevent that outrage. The speech of the hon. and learned Gentleman was a good speech from his own point of view, but he did not think the hon. and learned Gentleman's interruption explained the inconsistency between his arguments and his votes.

*MR. LAWSON WALTON: I do not think it is a good Bill; I think it is a very bad Bill.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he knew all that. He thought the criticisms of the clause from the Government Benches had been uttered under a complete misconception both of the purpose and effects of the clause. The purpose of the clause was to prevent in the future in regard to new licences that slow but inevitable growth of equitable rights, not recognised by law, which had grown up in regard to old licences under the existing system, and which had proved such a difficulty in the way of reducing licences. He did not believe there was an hon. Member in the House who differed from that particular statement of the policy which they ought to pursue. To effect that object, upon which they were all agreed, his hon. friends said they would prefer annual licences rather than leases for seven years. But there was nothing in the clause to prevent the issue of annual licences. The matter was left to the magistrates to determine. His hon. friend had added to the error of supposing that this Bill required the magistrates to grant leases, the further error that this clause required them to put the licence up to auction. The hon. Member not only misinterpreted the clause but he did so in a way which absolutely reversed its true character and the intention of those who framed it. He asked hon. Members to turn their attention for a moment to the phrase in the first paragraph of the second sub-section—

> "The justices of a licensing district on the grant of a new licence may attach to the grant of the licence such conditions, both as to the payments to be made and the tenure of the licence, and as to any other matters, as they think proper in the interests of the public."

His hon. friends also interpreted that sub-section of the clause to mean that the licensing justices were bound to see that the extremest sum was obtained for the monopoly value of a new licence that it was possible to obtain in the open market. How could the monopoly value of the licence be separated from the rest of the property?

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): By putting it up for auction.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: There is nothing about auction.

MR. LOUGH: It is the only plan.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that the monopoly value was only part of the interest of the licence. How could they put up for auction that which might be of enormous value apart from the licence and from the monopoly value of the licence? What the clause contemplated was that the magistrates should draw a distinction between the value that would attach to the licence were there free trade in the sale of liquor and the value which attached to it because there was not free trade in the sale of liquor. That could not be put up to auction separately, and it must be done by a rough and ready method.

MR. AINSWORTH said that if a licence was to be sold for the benefit of the public the object must be to get the utmost possible value for it. If they did not do that they would not be selling the licence in the public interest, but in the interest of the man who bought it, because he would be getting it for less than its real value.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he was not quite sure that he fully understood the purport of his hon. friend's interruption. His hon. friends were also puzzled by the words in the clause "private persons." Those words were meant to prevent the clause from being applied to cases in which the beneficiary from the monopoly was the corporation of a town or some other public body of the kind. He believed that some hon. Members thought this phrase had been inserted in order to protect or to aid one particular form in which it was intended to deal with licensed premises—namely, the Public-house Trust Corporation. It had nothing to do with it either directly or indirectly. It had no special reference whatever to any form of private trading in liquor; but it was conceivable that in some districts there might be a desire that any product of monopoly value should go to the public. It was intended to make this possible, and it ought to be possible. It would be very wrong so to arrange any licensing laws that the monopoly value should not go to the public. If they restricted the liquor trade they were almost certain to create a monopoly value, do what they would. No one desired to have free trade in drink; it had been tried and it had failed, and no one wanted to try the experiment again. If they were going to restrict the trade, the mere fact that it was restricted had a strong tendency to give it a monopoly value. All that the Government desired was to give the monopoly value to the public and not to the private individual. It was therefore recognised that the clause was a serious endeavour to carry out an object agreed to by both sides of the House.

*Mr. WHITTAKER said that there should be a term to licences with full power to deal with them at the end of the term. The right hon. Gentleman had prevented the possibility of this power from being enjoyed in the future. It was a principle of great importance that there should be full power on the part of the justices to deal with licences at some time or other. The present proposal was an enormous improvement on the original proposal in the Bill, but the Prime Minister had not met the criticisms urged against it. There was, first of all, the loss of annual control. The licences would not come before brewster sessions until the end of seven years. That was an undesirable change. They should come up annually for review, as to conduct, because it was important not to lose the annual control. It was also undesirable that the licensing authority should, so to say, sell the licence. They ought to sell the licence for an annual sum, and it ought to be a very substantial sum, but he did not like the system of paying down a lump sum for a licence to cover a period of years because under such circumstances it would be very difficult to take that licence away. Therefore it would be much better if the payment was an annual one. If this principle was so sound and good why should it not apply to all licences, to off-licences as well as on-licences? The expressions "private person" and "monopoly value" were by no means clear. What was meant by monopoly value? The Prime Minister had suggested to them what it was not, but he had not told them what the monopoly value was.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said that monopoly value was the difference in value between the sale of liquor in existing circumstances under the existing law and what the value would be if there was free trade in liquor.

*Mr. WHITTAKER said that amounted to the difference in the value of the premises with a licence and without. In the ordinary case if there were free trade in liquor there would be no special value attaching to the premises, and they would be like any other premises. On that definition the real meaning of the monopoly value would be the additional value which the granting of this monopoly added to the premises. That, however, did not coincide with the definition given by the Solicitor-General, who seemed to think that it depended upon the profits. The ordinary profits resulting from the trade in drink would be distinct from the monopoly value which the licence would give to the premises. Every successful trade was conducted at a profit and it did not mean that all the profit of carrying on the trade would be taken. It seemed to him that there was substance in the contention that practically these licences would still go to the great brewers.. He did not think they would get rid of monopoly by selling at the highest possible price, but he thought they must sell at the highest possible price if they were to get the monopoly value. If they were to sell to the highest bidder in order to get the full monopoly value the licences would go to the great brewers as before. It seemed to him that was inconsistent with the provision in the clause that they were going to protect the public interest. The buyer would have to sell the largest possible amount of drink in order to get a return for the price paid, and that would not be in the public interest. The hon. Member for the Tamworth Division had said that the justices could select the men. He thought the justices had very few opportunities of selecting the men now. The brewers selected the men and the justices had largely to take those who were offered to them. There was one point in the new clause he should like to make a remark upon. He did not like the idea of the extra levy upon licences going to the relief of local rates. At present licence duties went to the local authorities, and, therefore, to the relief of rates. The amount at present was comparatively small, but if they were to get into the way of levying on licences their full value that amount would become very substantial indeed, and it was undesirable that local authorities should depend for a large relief of the rates on the number of licences granted. He thought this extra charge should go to the National Exchequer rather than to the relief of local rates. The hon. Member for Manchester had suggested that under this proposal surrenders and exchanges might still continue, that was to say, it might be possible to surrender two or three licences in one place in order to get a new licence in another. As he read the proposal that would not be possible. If a new licence was to be obtained by the surrender of two or three others it must be perfectly obvious that they were not getting the full monopoly value. Therefore, it seemed to him that such an arrangement was not included under the proposal. He agreed with his hon. friend the Member for Dundee that this was introducing a very important change, and that they could not in any degree look upon the idea as a permanent one that one class of licences should pay full value to the State, while others would be allowed to pay only the nominal sum they paid now. He believed that in the near future they might look for very much increased licence duties.

There were unquestionably many respects in which this new proposal was an improvement on the old one. In the old proposal it was provided that the fees got for new licences should go to the compensation fund. That was not to be the case now. They were to go to the service of the public. He thought the clause abolished the possibility of exchanges and surrenders for new licences, and further, the new proposal would retain the power of granting new licences in non-county boroughs to the justices there. These were, he thought, important improvements. The plan was not the best one, and he felt certain that it would be a somewhat temporary one. He was afraid that not one of the existing licence-holders would adopt the suggestion of his hon. and learned friend of exchanging their licences for new ones on seven years terms, because under the Bill as it at present stood they would be entitled to very full compensation, while under the new arrangement they would be required to pay a very much increased fee. This was the beginning of a very great change indeed, and he thought that in the near future it would be extended to all licences. It certainly meant the end of the old condition of things. He regretted that under the operation of the closure this question could not receive anything like adequate discussion.

SIR J. STIRLING-MAXWELL (Glasgow, College), speaking as a friend to the Bill, ventured to repeat a Question of the hon. and learned Member opposite, which, he said, his right hon. friend had not answered. The Bill was designed to give compensation to existing licence-holders for an equitable right which Members on the Government side held that they possessed. That was laid down in the first part of the Bill; but they were now creating a new kind of licence in the future which would be unlike the old kind and would be much less valuable. How did the Prime Minister account for the discrepancy between the two? The difference did not represent the compensation, because that was already arranged for. It seemed to him that it only represented a flaw in the system which they were creating in this Bill. He would suggest that it might be possible at some date, without interfering with the system of compensation, to bring existing licences under the same improved conditions as were to be applied to the new ones.

MR. BOND (Nottingham, E.) said it was extremely important that the Committee should know what they were voting about, and he confessed he had some difficulty in interpreting some of the words in the Amendment. His difficulty was chiefly about "private person" and "monopoly value." He thought the Prime Minister misapprehended what was meant by "private person." These words had created a good deal of alarm, because it was thought the use of the words in this connection meant that individual arrangements would be excluded, whilst a similar disability was not inflicted on brewery companies or persons associated and brought together for the purpose of carrying on trade. He thought the matter ought to be made plainer. In regard to "monopoly value" it seemed to him a monopoly must mean an exclusive right to sell. He could understand the words "monopoly value" would apply to a licence granted to a publican to sell liquor in a village where he had no competitor within a radius of two or three miles, but in a town where there would be four, five, or six competitors he thought the term "monopoly value" could hardly be applied. He submitted that persons would not go into a business of a speculative character upon conditions of the nature indicated in the Amendment, and that the new clause would really have the effect of making it almost impossible to get new licences taken up. He could not but think that the passage of this clause in the form in which it now stood would go a long way towards bringing about a result he was sure the right hon. Gentleman did not desire, namely, that there would be hardly any new licences granted, even when they were required in the public interest.

MR. CRIPPS said they all recognised that as regarded new licences no right of compensation should arise as in the case of old licences. He understood that licences would be put up to auction, and granted for a term of seven years, but the right of annual revision should be retained to the magistrates in order that they might see that a public-house was being properly carried on. Their object was to have the Bill in the best possible form in justice to existing interests, and he hoped the points which had been raised would be fully considered by the Prime Minister and the Solicitor-General before the Report stage.

Question put, and negatived.

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

And, it being Eleven of the clock, the Chairman proceeded, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 5th July, to put the Question on the Amendment already proposed from the Chair.

Question, "That these words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

The Chairman then proceeded to put forthwith the Question necessary to dispose of the allotted Business to be concluded on the 3rd allotted Day.

Question, "That the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill," put, and agreed to.

Clause 5:—

MR. WHITLEY said that on behalf of his hon. friend the Member for Flint Boroughs he wished to move the omission of the words "may if they think fit," and insert "shall." The object of the Amendment was to make it mandatory upon quarter sessions to reduce the area of the district in which the compensation would operate, and in which the committees would act in the matter of reduction of the licences. [Loud interruptions.]

*THE CHAIRMAN said it would be impossible to go on with the business if this disturbance continued.

MR. WHITLEY said he understood that it was not the intention to go on further with the Bill that night after the guillotine had fallen. The purpose of his Amendment, as he had said, was to reduce the areas of the districts in which the compensation fund would operate, and in which the committees would act in the matter of the reductions of licences. It had been found in connection with the Education Act that where the areas were large, administration was unsatisfactory. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 23, to leave out the words 'may, if they think fit,' and insert the word 'shall.'"—(*Mr. Whitley.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

MR. LOUGH said that on a point of order he wished to draw attention to a paragraph in the Closure Resolution, which said that the Chairman should proceed—

"Successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments moved by the Government of which notice has been given (but no other Amendments), and on every Question necessary to dispose of the allotted business to be concluded on the allotted day."

Now the Committee had disposed of the allotted business for this allotted day, and he would like to know whether it was in order to go on with the discussion of the Bill

*THE CHAIRMAN said that although the allotted business for the allotted day had been completed, the Committee could go on with other business, as there were still fifty minutes until midnight.

MR. LOUGH said that he thought the words in the Closure Resolution forbade the Committee making any further progress that evening.

*THE CHAIRMAN: It is competent for the Committee to proceed with the Fifth Clause. If the hon. Member does not desire further discussion, it is open to him to ask the Government to move that Progress be reported.

*MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS said that, as far as the Government were concerned, they were quite prepared to proceed with the clause. He thought that was also the opinion of the Committee generally, in order that as many Amendments as possible might be saved from the application of the guillotine.

MR. LOUGH said that, having passed a Motion, the Committee ought to be bound by it.

*MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS said he hoped the hon. Gentleman would not move to report Progress. As regarded the Amendment, there were many districts which, if divided, would render the compensation area insufficient. He therefore hoped the Committee would not accept the Amendment.

Mr. J. H. LEWIS (Flint Boroughs) said he was not convinced by the argument of the Home Secretary. He thought it desirable that the quarter sessions should be told distinctly that it would be necessary for them to subdivide their districts in the interests of the efficiency of the Act. There was an undue centralisation of authority in the Bill.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 267; Noes, 157. (Division List No. 224.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hn.Sir H.
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt.Hon. A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beach, Rt.Hn.Sir Michael Hicks
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, J.H.M.(Dublin Univ.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn.J.A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Colomb, Rt.Hn. Sir John C.R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir Horatio D.(Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dewar, Sir T.R.(Tower Hamlets
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale, Rt.Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt.Hn. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt.Hn.Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants., W.)
Fergusson, Rt.Hn.Sir J.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S.(Warwick, S.W.)
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn)
Gordon, Maj. E. (T'r Hamlets)
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E. W(B'ry S. Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.)
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Rt Hn. H(Somers't, E
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, Jn. (Kent, Faversham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T.(Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.(Salop.
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks., N.R.
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W.(Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter(Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman

Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh, W.
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Majendie, James A. H.
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W.F.
Maxwell, Rt. Hn. Sir H. E (Wigt'n
Maxwell, W.J.H. (Dumfriessh.)
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Dowd, John
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hon. M.W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, H. C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H (Sheffield
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh., N.)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H. (Yorks.)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Young, Samuel
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Asher, Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Henry
Barran, Rowland Hisrt
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Delany William
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellice, Capt. E. C (S Andrw's Bghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidstone
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hain, Edward
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayter, Rt Hon Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kemp, Lieut.-Colonel George

Kennedy,Vincent P.(Cavan, W.
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir CharlesBenjamin
Mansfield Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Newnes, Sir George
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Reid, Sir R.Threshie(Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw.(Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas,David Alfred (Merthyr
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wason, Eugene(Clackmannan)
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Woodhouse,SirJ.T.(Huddersf'd

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. J. H. Whitley and Mr. Herbert Lewis.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.) said it had already been decided that quarter sessions should have power to divide their administrative areas into districts for the purposes of the Bill, and the object of the Amendment he was about to move was to secure that if such divisions were made the districts should be those at present existing. The advantage of such an arrangement was that in each division there would then be local magistrates who for a long time had been in the habit of considering the requirements of the particular district, and who therefore had practical experience of the wants of the neighbourhood in the matter of public drinking facilities. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 24, after the word 'Act,' to insert the words 'which districts shall consist of the licensing districts or licensing divisions into which such area is now divided.'"—(*Mr. Herbert Roberts.*)

Question proposed, "That these words be there inserted."

SIR EDWARD CARSON suggested that, inasmuch as the Committee had decided to leave it in the option of the quarter sessions to divide the county into districts, it would be far better to leave it to them to decide what those districts should be. The reason quarter sessions were being taken as the administrative power was that the existing districts were too small, and by reason of their smallness would frustrate the object of the insurance scheme of the Bill.

MR. WHITLEY thought there was much force in the last observation of the learned Solicitor-General. Personally, he was not in favour of too large districts, but, on the other hand, he did not want them too small. He suggested that the Solicitor-General should give some indication to the Committee that the Government would attempt to provide that the districts should be of a reasonable size.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. NUSSEY (Pontefract) said the remarks of the Solicitor-General on the last Amendment put in a nutshell the case for the proposal he was about to make. The ostensible object of the Bill was to reduce the number of licences, but it was obvious that if the counties were divided into too small districts the amount of the fund raised would be so small as to render impossible any reduction within a reasonable period. His Amendment provided that in no case should the districts be of less than £10,000 annual value. He was not tied to that particular figure; he simply desired to give some direction to the quarter sessions to prevent the districts being too small. In many districts the full amount of the tax would not be levied, and in such cases the amount of the fund raised would be very small. He hoped the Government might see their way to give the Amendment favourable consideration.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 26, at the end, to insert the words, 'Provided that the annual value of premises to be taken as for the purpose of the publican's licence duty within any such district shall in the aggregate be not less than ten thousand pounds.'"—(*Mr. Nussey.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS said he could not accept the Amendment. The Bill provided that quarter sessions should decide for themselves what the area was to be and he thought it would be far better to leave all these questions to the discretion of that body.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 124; Noes, 234. (Division List No. 225.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Asher, Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Caldwell, James
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cremer, William Randal
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Delany, William
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Edwards, Frank
Ellice, CaptEC (S.Andrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts)
Evans,SirFrancisH.(Maidstone
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harcourt,LewisV.(Rossendale)
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, VincentP.(Cavan,W.
Kitson, Sir James
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, SirJosephF.(Accrington)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon

Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (Yorkshire, E.R.)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Huddersf'd

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Nussey and Mr. Guest.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt Hon. Sir H.
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, J. H. M. (Dublin Univ.)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire)
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Gordon, Maj. Evans-(T'r H'mlets
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S. Edmonds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords. N.W.
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.)
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Rt. Hn. H (Somers'tE
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, John (Kent, Faversham
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop)
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Knowles, Sir Lees
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks, N.R
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W.
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, Rt. Hn. Sir H. E. (Wigt'n
Maxwell, W. J. H (Dumfriesshire
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Dowd, John
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson

Ridley, Hon.M.W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S.Forde (Bethnal Green
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Smith,HC(North'mb.Tyneside)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hon. Arthur(Ormskirk
Stanley, EdwardJas.(Somerset)
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J.M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Tully, Jasper
Valentine, Viscount
Vincent, Col.SirC.E.H(Sheffield
Wilker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Sir Charles G.E. (Notts
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York,E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Young, Samuel

Tellers for the Noes, Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

Mr. LEVY (Leicestershire, Loughborough) moved to omit Sub-section 2 of Clause 5, which empowers quarter sessions to delegate their powers to a committee. He objected that the great powers to be vested in the Home Secretary might override quarter sessions. The Bill provided that the Home Secretary might appoint the committee. That committee might have to deal with questions of compensation and the renewal or refusal of licences. It was imperative upon quarter sessions to delegate certain powers to the committee, and he wished to know whether quarter sessions would have power to revise the decisions of the committee. He thought the House should have some information as to the object of handing over great powers to a committee, of the constitution of which they were told nothing. The Government had indicated their opinion that counties should be divided into somewhat smaller areas, and that being so it seemed unnecessary to have any committee set up.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 27, to leave out Sub-section (2)."—(*Mr. Levy.*)

Question proposed, "That the words of Sub-section (2) to the word 'appointed,' in page 3, line 28, stand part of the clause."

Sir EDWARD CARSON said he would remind the hon. Member that there were county licensing committees, and it was necessary that power should be delegated to the committees which would be set up under this Bill. Already under Clause 4 certain powers had been transferred to the committees. He thought the hon. Member would quite see that it would be impossible for the quarter sessions properly to supervise all the questions with which the committees would have to deal relating to renewal.

And, it being Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again to-morrow.

COUNTY OF SUFFOLK BILL.

Ordered, That Mr. Goddard be discharged, and that Mr. Soames be added to the Select Committee.—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*)

Adjourned at three minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 13th July, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Skipton Water and Improvement Bill; Soothill Nether Urban District Tramways Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

De Trafford Estate Bill [Lords]; Ilford Urban District Council Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed.

PIER AND HARBOUR PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2) BILL.

Report from the Committee that they had divided the Bill into two Bills:—

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 2) Bill (comprising the Hartlepool and Waterford Orders); and

¶Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill (comprising the Islay Order), pursuant to Standing Order 208A, brought up, and read.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill. Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed] [Title amended]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered to-morrow.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 10) BILL.

Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered to-morrow.

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; from Aberchirder; Barnoldby le Beck; Barrow on Humber; Blackburn; Bozeat; Chorlton cum Hardy; Clacton on sea; Earl's Barton; Edinburgh; Enfield; Finedon; Heaton Mersey; Heaton Moor; Hounslow; Irchester; Levenshulme; Little Harrowden; Liverpool; London (N.W.); Louth; Lunesdale; Mangotsfield; New Brighton; Newcastle on Tyne (three); Oldbury; Ottery St. Mary; Pegswood; Reddish; Rosset; St. Margaret's; Scunthorpe; South Somercotes; Stafford; Stallingborough; Sturminster Marshall; Wellingborough; Willington; Wimborne; Winterton; Wollaston; and Woodside; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petition from Bermondsey, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

STREET BETTING BILL [LORDS].

Petition from Dundee, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

VALUATION BILL.

Petition from Eastbourne, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS ACT, 1897.

Petitions for alteration of Law; from Barnsley; Jarrow; and Wood Green; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

PRISONS (ENGLAND AND WALES).

Paper [presented 12th July] to be printed. [No. 173.]

SEA FISHERIES REGULATION ACT, 1888.

Paper [presented 12th July] to be printed. [No. 248.]

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).

Copy presented, of Colonial Report, No. 420 (St. Helena, Annual Report for 1903) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

RAILWAY (CONTINUOUS BRAKES).

Copy presented, of Return by Railway Companies of the United Kingdom for the six months ending the 31st December, 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

GAS AND WATER WORKS FACILITIES ACT, 1870.

Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade as to dispensing with the consents of the Melbourn Rural District Council and the Meldreth and Shepreth Parish Councils in the case of the Meldreth and Melbourn District Gas and Water Provisional Order [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 249.]

GAS AND WATER WORKS FACILITIES ACT, 1870.

Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade as to dispensing with the consent of the Little Stambridge Parish Meeting in the case of the Rochford Gas Provisional Order [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 250.]

GAS AND WATER WORKS FACILITIES ACT, 1870.

Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade as to dispensing with the consent of the Cheshunt Urban District Council in the case of the Waltham Abbey and Cheshunt Gas Provisional Order [by Act]; to lie upon the Table. and to be printed. [No. 251.]

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1884.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 9th July, 1904, declaring that George J. Stuck, Skilled Labourer, Royal Laboratory, War Office, was appointed without a Civil Service Certificate through inadvertence on the part of the Head of his Department [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

GOVERNMENT SHIPS BILL.

Copy ordered, "of Memorandum explanatory of the Provisions of the Government Ships Bill."—(*Mr. Pretyman.*)

Copy presented accordingly; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 252.]

GAS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 2) BILL [LORDS].

Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill Lords]."—(*Mr. Bonar Law.*)

GAS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 3) BILL [LORDS].

Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 3) Bill [Lords]."—(*Mr. Bonar Law.*)

GAS AND WATER ORDERS CONFIRMATION BILL [LORDS].

Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]."—(*Mr. Bonar Law.*)

WATER ORDERS CONFIRMATION BILL [LORDS].

Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]."—(*Mr. Bonar Law.*)

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2) BILL [LORDS].

Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [Lords]."—(*Mr. Bonar Law.*)

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 4) BILL [LORDS].

Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [Lords]."—(*Mr. Bonar Law.*)

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 6) BILL [LORDS].

Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill [Lords]."—(*Mr. Bonar Law.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Irish Degree of Bachelor of Arts.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the total number of candidates from the Queen's Colleges of Belfast, Cork, and

Galway, and Magee College, Derry, who have taken the degree of B.A. at the Royal University during the past five years; and the total number from Kelvin House, Belfast, who have done so during the same period.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The Royal University is precluded from taking cognisance, by way of qualification, of the places of education of candidates for the B.A. Degree Examination. Candidates for the degree when entering for the examination are requested, however to state on their entry forms the names of any institutions at which they may have been prepared for the examinations, and from these statements the following returns have been made:—

B.A. Degree.

Candidates have passed the examination for this degree from the undermentioned institutions as follows:—

	In 1899.	In 1900.	In 1901.	In 1902.	In 1903.
Queen's College, Belfast .	29	17	17	9	13
Queen's College, Cork . .	4	3	4	8	3
Queen's College, Galway .	7	4	7	8	7
Magee College, Londonderry	3	4	2	4	7
Kelvin House, Belfast .	18	19	15	25	19
Queen's College and Kelvin House, Belfast. . . .	4	5	6	2	2
Queen's College, Belfast, and Magee College, Londonderry	—	—	1	1	1

Increase of Pauperism in the Large Parishes of Scotland.

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS (Glasgow, Camlachie): To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether the Local Government Board are aware that, during the last ten years, there has been a steady increase in the number of outdoor and indoor poor in some of the large burghal parishes of Scotland and a consequent increase in the cost of their maintenance; and whether, looking to the state of trade during these years, the Board will consider the subject and devise some means of arriving at the causes which have contributed towards the result by appointing a Departmental or other Committee to inquire into the conditions under which poor relief is granted in the different parishes in Scotland.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) The attention of the Local Government Board has been drawn to the increase of pauperism in the large parishes, and they are at present engaged in collecting information as to the causes.

British Naval Display in the Streets of Rome.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he can state under what circumstances was a naval display carried out in the streets of Rome on Sunday, 19th June last; how many men of the Mediterranean squadron took part in it; who is responsible for the display; and had it the sanction of the Italian Government.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) The Admiralty have no information as to any naval display having been carried out in the streets of Rome on 19th June. The Commander in Chief reports that during the visit of the Fleet to Civita Vecchia, between the 15th and 22nd June, leave to visit Rome was given to all men of good character who wished to go there, and that large numbers availed themselves of the opportunity.

Appointment of Telegraph Boys to Rural Telegraph Offices.

Mr. MANSFIELD (Lincolnshire, Spalding): To ask the Postmaster-General whether it is proposed to appoint telegraph boys in all the rural postal telegraph offices; and, if so, whether, in view of the scale of remuneration received by rural postmasters, such appointments may either be made by the postmasters themselves or such messengers shall be selected from the postmaster's family wherever that is possible.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) It is not proposed to appoint regular telegraph messengers at all rural telegraph offices, but only at offices where they are found to be warranted. At offices where regular telegraph messengers are employed the boys are selected by the postmasters, subject to the approval of the district surveyor. At offices at which regular messengers are not employed it is not unusual for the delivery of telegrams to be made by members of the sub-postmaster's family.

Teaching of Hygiene in Schools.

Dr. THOMPSON (Monaghan, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education if his attention has been drawn to the recommendations of the deputation which waited, on Monday last, on the Marquess of Londonderry at the Education Office, on the importance of teaching elementary hygiene in the public schools of the country; and if, pending a comprehensive scheme of instruction in matters relating to public health, he will direct that the ten sanitary laws detailed by the President of the British Medical Association shall be tabulated and hung up in a prominent place in each school in Great Britain and Ireland.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) The Board of Education are considering by what methods the satisfactory teaching of elementary hygiene may be best secured in the schools of the country. Amongst other things it is essential that the instruction should be given by properly qualified teachers. I am doubtful as to the educational value of the method proposed by the hon. Member. I must remind the hon. Member that the powers of the Board only extend to England and Wales.

Local Education Fund—Use of Surplus Money where Endowment Exceeds Education Rate.

Lord EDMUND FITZMAURICE (Wiltshire, Cricklade): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education if they have decided what course should be pursued by a county council under Section 13, Sub-section 2, of the Education Act, 1902, when the moneys arising in any given year from an endowment, which is to be credited in aid of the rate in any parish, exceed the total annual amount raised by rate for the purposes of public elementary education in that parish; and if the Education Office has decided that the overseers of the parish are to apply the residue in aid of purposes other than education for which the poor rate is levied in the parish.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) The Board have not had occasion to give a decision on the point referred to in the question, though it has been incidentally raised in a few cases, and it is doubtful whether they are competent to decide it authoritatively. As at present advised, the Board consider that the proper course is for the trustees to apply to the Board, who will consult with the loc education authority, for a scheme under the Charitable Trusts Acts to provide for the application of the surplus income remaining after defraying the education rate in the parish or parishes served by the school to educational purposes.

Naval Works at Rosyth.

Mr. SCOTT MONTAGU (Hampshire, New Forest): To ask the Civil Lord of the Admiralty whether the projected naval works at Roseneath are being pushed forward or are stopped; and whether, in view of the fact that Roseneath forms the only naval base in the North Sea, such works will be continued with the least possible delay.

(*Answered by Mr. Arthur Lee.*) I presume Rosyth is intended. Good progress is being made with the necessary preliminary works and preparation of plans and estimates. It has not yet been possible to present a total Estimate to Parliament, and consequently money is not yet available for pushing on with the main scheme. No delay, however, has occurred, and there has been no change of policy with regard to this project.

German Officers' Visit to Devonport—Photographing Fortifications, Etc.

MR. SCOTT MONTAGU: To ask the Civil Lord of the Admiralty whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that German naval officers have photographed the fortifications and the dockyard at Devonport; and, if so, whether he proposes to take any action in the matter in the interests of our national defence; and will he say whether like facilities are granted to British officers in German naval ports.

(*Answered by Mr. Arthur Lee.*) Nothing is known of the occurrence referred to in the Question, but if anything of an improper nature had taken place it would have been reported by the responsible authorities.

National Expenditure for 1903-4.

MR. McKENNA (Monmouthshire, N.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can give under the customary headings the actual expenditure for the year ending 31st March, 1904.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) It is not clear what the hon. Member means by "actual expenditure under the customary headings." "Actual expenditure" is generally held to be the same as audited expenditure, the figures for which will not be available until the Appropriation Accounts are published next spring. The amounts issued from the Exchequer to meet expenditure for last year have been given in the Budget Statement under the main heads, and the amounts so issued to the various Civil Departments are given in the Annual Finance Accounts, which are being delivered to-day.

Revenue from Additional Duty on Goods Removed from Bond.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what is the total amount of revenue derived by the Customs from the charge of 5s. additional per £100 of duty paid on dutiable goods removed from a Customs warehouse, and what amount of the total sum was realised from each article in the financial year ending the 31st March, 1904.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The total amount derived by the Customs in the financial year 1903–4 from the statutory charge of 5s. per £100 of duty paid on goods cleared from Customs warehouses was £30,797, made up as follows, viz.:—

	£
On chicory, cocoa, and coffee .	793
On dried fruit	876
On spirits, foreign	8,218
On tea	16,259
On wine	1,774
On sugar, etc.	2,877
Total . . .	£30,797

NOTE.—These amounts do not include the charges on Customs goods cleared from Excise warehouses (which are not referred to the Question), nor do they include £14,151 derived from the similar statutory charge of 2s. 6d. per cent. on tobacco.

Tibet Expedition—Relief of India of Cost Involved.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether, looking to the Imperial character which the expedition into Tibet has assumed, he will move His Majesty's Government to relieve India of the cost involved.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The Answer is in the negative. The Tibetan question is essentially an Indian interest.

Salary of Dr. Collins, of Ballinasloe.

Dr. THOMPSON: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will explain why the Local Government Board for Ireland have refused to sanction the increase of salary granted to Dr. Collins, of Ballinasloe, seeing that this officer has had thirteen years service without a complaint; that his salary is now £15 a year less than it was when he was first appointed; and that the Local Government Board have quite recently sanctioned a salary of £150 to a medical officer of a much smaller dispensary district in the same neighbourhood.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) In answer to the first part of the Question, I refer to my reply to the similar Question of Wednesday last by the hon. Member for East Galway.† Dr. Collins was appointed dispensary medical officer in 1891, at a salary of £112 a year. His present salary is £120 a year, together with a small annual payment as compensation for reduction of income arising out of the operation of the Local Government Act of 1898. The district referred to at the end of the Question is wholly rural, and affords small scope for private practice. Dr. Collins resides in the town of Ballinasloe, and has good opportunities for private practice.

Salary of Teacher of Victoria Street National School, Lurgan.

Colonel SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Commissioners of National Education have received a statement of the case of the principal teacher of Victoria Street National School, Lurgan (District 11, Roll No. 15,020), in which it is shown that the new system of fixed salaries, introduced in 1900, owing to the rapid increase in the average attendance, has resulted in a loss to the teacher of over £60 in the first three years, and that a teacher of the same service, standing, and qualifications, and the same average attendance, but whose attendance during the three years was normal, would receive about £900 more in salary before being pensioned than the teacher of the Victoria Street School; and, if so, whether in view of the statement of the Resident Commissioner that no teacher would lose a single penny by the change, the Commissioners, under Rule 200 (iii.) or otherwise, will give special consideration to this case, and increase the remuneration of the teacher to correspond with the increased average attendance of the school.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The Commissioners do not admit the loss of income alleged by this teacher. On fixing his income under the present system the fact that the average attendance at the school was increasing rapidly was taken into consideration, and he was allowed not merely the average of his receipts for the three years ended 31st March, 1900, as his initial salary under the new system, but he got the benefit of Rule 200 (iii.) and was allowed a "normal" income of £100 per annum. This "normal" income represented the estimated value of his position at the time on the supposition that the old system of payments remained in force. The abolition of the old system of payments has resulted in an increase of the actual payments to national teachers generally of more than £40,000 per annum in three years. The teacher referred to was promoted to the second grade from 1st April, 1903, which carried with it an increased salary of £7 per annum. He is eligible for further triennial increases of good-service salary according to the prescribed scale and also for promotion, by which it is possible for him to reach an income of £175 per annum exclusive of the annual capitation payment from the school grant under the Irish Education Act, 1892, which payment is augmented by any increase in his average. His prospects are much better in every way under the new system than under the old. No such unqualified promise was given by the Resident Commissioner in regard to the salaries of teachers as stated in the Question.

---

† See page 800.

Army—Men with less than Five Years to serve.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.) To ask the Secretary of State for War if he can give the number of men with less than five years yet to serve in the following regiments, batteries, and battalions which will proceed to India during the next trooping season: 13th Hussars; 19th, 20th, and 28th Batteries of Field Artillery; 62nd, 64th, 77th, and 81st Companies of Garrison Artillery; 2nd Battalion Royal Fusiliers; 2nd Battalion Cheshire Regiment; 1st Battalion Royal Irish Regiment; 1st Battalion Highland Light Infantry; 1st Battalion Manchester Regiment; and also, as regards drafts, for every regiment, battery, and battalion in India that will require them during the next trooping season, and which drafts will be found from their groups in the case of cavalry and artillery, and in the case of infantry from their linked battalions, can he state the proportion of men with more than five years yet to serve.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The number of men with less than five years yet to serve in the following regiments, batteries, and battalions which will proceed to India during the next trooping season, is as follows:—

13th Hussars - - - - -	401
19th Battery Royal Field Artillery	134
20th ,, ,, ,,	114
28th ,, ,, ,,	124
No. 62 Company Royal Garrison Artillery - - - -	102
No. 64 ,, ,, ,,	106
No. 77 ,, ,, ,,	127
No. 81 ,, ,, ,,	153
2nd Battalion Royal Fusiliers -	537
2nd ,, Cheshire Regiment -	515
1st ,, Royal Irish Regiment - - - - -	708
1st Battalion Highland Light Infantry - - - - -	809
1st Battalion Manchester Regiment	639

The number of men with more than five years to serve in each unit or group finding Indian drafts this trooping season, and the draft required in each are as follows:—

Royal Artillery Drafts.

		Draft required.	Number in unit supplying drafts with more than five years yet to serve.
Royal Horse Artillery - -	Group 1 -	71	250
	,, 2 -	104	185
Royal Field Artillery - -	Group 1 -	79	264
	,, 2 -	165	315
	,, 3 -	141	316
	,, 4 -	111	401
	,, 5 -	148	265
	,, 6 -	156	263
	,, 7 -	113	426
Royal Garrison Artillery (including Mountain Batteries)	Group 1 -	159	100
	,, 2 -	148	185
	,, 3 -	136	163
	,, 4 -	154	107
	,, 5 -	114	129
	,, 6 -	121	123

Cavalry and Infantry Drafts.

		Draft required.	Number in unit supplying drafts with more than five years yet to serve.
6th Dragoon Guards - - - - - -		55	111
1st Dragoons - - - - - - -		36	76
3rd Hussars - - - - - - -		37	167
4th Hussars - - - - - - -		66	139
Royal Scots	2nd Battalion	224	135
Royal West Surrey	1st ,,	200	99
Royal Lancaster	1st ,,	169	74
Royal Warwickshire	1st ,,	207	77
Liverpool	1st ,,	199	78
Lincolnshire	1st ,,	225	94
Suffolk	2nd ,,	27	112
Somersetshire Light Infantry	1st ,,	188	83
West Yorkshire	1st ,,	191	89
East Yorkshire	1st ,,	207	103
Bedfordshire	1st ,,	270	69
Leicestershire	1st ,,	105	169
Yorkshire	2nd ,,	197	94
Royal Scots Fusiliers	1st ,,	263	77
Royal Welsh Fusiliers	2nd ,,	199	81
South Wales Borderers	1st ,,	270	74
King's Own Scottish Borderers	2nd ,,	223	39
Scottish Rifles	1st ,,	201	70
Gloucestershire	1st ,,	156	57
East Lancashire	2nd ,,	285	88
East Surrey	2nd ,,	158	141
West Riding	2nd ,,	194	68
Royal Sussex	1st ,,	92	217
South Staffordshire	2nd ,,	185	101
Dorsetshire	1st ,,	194	76
South Lancashire	1st ,,	259	99
Welsh	2nd ,,	232	63
Royal Highlanders	2nd ,,	93	91
Oxfordshire Light Infantry	1st ,,	124	124
Essex	1st ,,	111	105
Northamptonshire	1st ,,	266	65
Shropshire Light Infantry	2nd ,,	126	52
Middlesex	1st ,,	197	62
King's Royal Rifles	2nd ,,	107	84
Wiltshire	1st ,,	225	90
North Staffordshire	2nd ,,	165	112
York and Lancaster	1st ,,	192	76
Durham Light Infantry	1st ,,	185	62
Seaforth Highlanders	1st ,,	80	78
Gordon Highlanders	2nd ,,	168	110
Royal Irish Rifles	1st ,,	195	88
Royal Irish Fusiliers	2nd ,,	319	97
Connaught Rangers	2nd ,,	147	119
Argyll and Sutherland Highlanders	2nd ,,	190	90
Royal Munster Fusiliers	1st ,,	176	142

Military Operations in Northern Nigeria.

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the further despatch, expected two months and a half ago at an early date, has been received; and whether he can make public the details of the military operations which resulted about a year ago in the capture of Burmi in Northern Nigeria, and the death of the ex-Amir of Sokoto.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) The publication of the details of the military operations in question is at present under consideration.

Crime in Ceylon—Transportation instead of Capital Punishment.

MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will consider the advisability of substituting transportation to the Andaman Islands in cases of murder and serious crime in Ceylon, in view of the increase in cases of murder and manslaughter, as proved by Major de Wilton's Report on Prisons, Colombo, in his official Report, as various authorities have declared that such transportation would prove a greater deterrent than the taking of life.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) The question of transporting convicts from Ceylon to the Andaman Islands has been raised on various occasions; and though I will give the matter further consideration I am not, as at present advised, prepared to reconsider the decision of my predecessors, which has been adverse to the proposal.

Construction of Malay Peninsula Railway.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether a convention has been concluded with the Sultan of Johore for the construction by the Federated Malay States of the last section of the Malay Peninsula private line of railway from a point on the main land opposite Penang to a point opposite Singapore; and, if not, whether an arrangement, described by Sir Frank Swettenham, of such vital importance to the Straits Settlements and the Protected Malay States, will be much longer delayed.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) A convention providing for the construction by the Federated Malay States of a railway through Johore in continuation of the main trunk line through those States was signed on the 11th instant.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Admiralty Contractors and Trades Unionism.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he will make inquiry into the alleged discharge by Messrs. Lysaght, of Bristol, Government contractors, of workmen on account of their membership of a trade union, during the continuance of a running contract; and whether, if this be so, it is not a violation of the pledge given by Sir John Hibbert and the hon. Member for Poplar, on behalf of the Government, on 3rd August, 1893, in interpretation of the Fair Wages Resolution.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): Inquiry has been made and Messrs. Lysaght state that the discharges referred to were due to shortness of orders, but that a preference was shown to non-union men. It is difficult to say whether this constitutes any breach of the undertaking referred to in the second part of the Question, but the Admiralty are prepared to do what they can to prevent any preference being shown by contractors as between unionists and non-unionists.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: May I ask the hon. Gentleman whether on behalf of his Department he will make inquiry, or rather cause inquiry to be made, into the facts which are alleged in the Question, viz., that unionists were discharged on account of their membership of a trades union. I am prepared to bring evidence in support of that.

MR. PRETYMAN: Any evidence the hon. Member desires to put before the Admiralty will have most careful consideration, and inquiry will of course be made.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): What has been the form of the inquiry? Has it been personal or by correspondence?

MR. PRETYMAN: As I indicated in my Answer, Messrs. Lysaght have been asked for an explanation, and the one they supplied I have communicated to the House.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: If my hon. friend brings evidence, as he says he is prepared to do, will the hon. Gentleman make personal inquiry?

MR. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe): And will he make inquiry from the officials of the unions to which the men discharged belong?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member has said he will make inquiry.

War Office Contractors and Trades Unionism.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether he will make inquiry into the alleged discharge by Messrs. Lysaght, of Bristol, Government contractors, of workmen, on account of their membership of a trade union, during the continuance of a running contract; whether, if this be so, it is a violation of the pledge given by Sir John Hibbert and the hon. Member for Poplar, on behalf of the Government, on 3rd August, 1893, in interpretation of the Fair Wages Resolution.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Mr. BROMLEY DAVENPORT, Cheshire, Macclesfield): Inasmuch as no instructions were issued to the War Office consequent upon the debate referred to, it would appear that the promise then given was not intended to apply to the War Department. The Department, however, does not recognise nor approve of any preference for or against trades unionists as such, and I am willing to agree that measures shall be taken to prevent contractors engaged upon War Office work from dismissing men solely for the reason that they are or are not members of a trade union.

Army Horses and Epizootic Lymphangitis.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether horses belonging to the Woolwich Garrison are suffering or have recently suffered from epizootic lymphangitis; and whether it is proposed to employ any of the horses from this garrison on manœuvres.

MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: There are at present forty-four horses suffering from epizootic lymphangitis in the Woolwich Garrison, of which twenty-seven are convalescent and seventeen still under treatment. No horses will be taken to the manœuvres from units which have had a case of lymphangitis within two months of the date of the commencement of the manœuvres.

Chinese Coolies in the Transvaal—Desertions from the Compounds.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies how many Chinese coolies have deserted from the Transvaal mines on which they were employed; whether all who escaped have been arrested; whether any have been charged before a magistrate, and whether any punishments have been inflicted; whether any persons have been charged, under the provisions of the Labour Importation Ordinance, with the offence of harbouring or concealing an escaped labourer; and, if he has no information on these points, whether he will ask Lord Milner for particulars.

The following Question also appeared on the Paper—

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is now in a position to make any statement relative to the desertion of two Chinese coolies from the New Comet Mine at Johannesburg, and the desertion of fifteen coolies on the way to Pretoria; and, if not, whether he will ask for particulars from Lord Milner.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. LYTTELTON, Warwick and Leamington): I have not received information on these points, but I have already stated that I will ask Lord Milner for particulars.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): When will the right hon. Gentleman ask Lord Milner for particulars? I have been asking that for the last ten days.

MR. LYTTELTON: The letter was written yesterday.

Treatment of Chinese Coolies on Landing in South Africa.

DR. MACNAMARA: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he has yet received the despatch from Lord Milner, asked for by cable on 23rd June, relative to the arrival and landing at Durban of coolies from the steamship "Tweeddale" and their transmission to Johannesburg; and, if so, whether he will state the terms of Lord Milner's report.

MR. LYTTELTON: I have not yet received the despatch in question.

DR. MACNAMARA: When may we expect it?

MR. LYTTELTON: In about a month from the 25th June.

Administration of Native Affairs in the Transvaal.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Department of Native Affairs in the Transvaal is now being reduced; whether the services of three out of six Native Commissioners have been dispensed with; and whether the functions of the Native Commissioners are being entrusted to the resident magistrates; and, if so, will he state what steps His Majesty's Government took before sanctioning these arrangements to satisfy itself that they are not prejudical to the interests of the native population in the Transvaal.

MR. LYTTELTON: Owing to the necessity of dealing with a large native population scattered and unsettled by war, a larger establishment was created at first than will be required in normal conditions, and, to avoid overlapping, some reductions are taking place. The necessity of sympathetic administration by magistrates fully qualified by experience is, I am aware, fully appreciated by Lord Milner.

Tithe Reform in Macedonia.

MR. HUGH LAW (Donegal, W.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the schemes of tithe reform, stated to have been adopted by the Porte for application to certain villages in Macedonia, embrace control by the Civil Assessors or European officers.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl PERCY, Kensington, S.): Two schemes of tithe reform have been under consideration, but we are not aware that a final decision has yet been arrived at.

Swiss Lace sold at Nice as Irish.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the statement in the Nice Consular Report that lace made in Switzerland is sold at Nice as Irish-made lace; and whether he proposes to take any, and, if so, what steps to safeguard the interests of this Irish industry.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds Central): I have seen a statement in the Report of His Majesty's Consul at Nice that Irish lace appears to be counterfeited at St. Gall in Switzerland. Inquiries will be made on the subject.

Statistical Abstract of the United Kingdom.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade why the Statistical Abstract of the United Kingdom for the year ending December, 1902, was only issued on 9th September, 1903; why the Abstract for the year 1903 has not yet been issued; and whether there is any prospect of its being available on an early day.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The date of issue of the Statistical Abstract depends on the date of receipt by the Board of Trade of the particulars supplied to them for the purpose by other Departments including the financial statements for the year ending 31st March. It is hoped that the Abstract may be published in August this year, and every effort will be made to expedite its issue.

Borstal Convict Prison—Attack on Warders.

DR. MACNAMARA: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the circumstances attending the sentencing of a convict last Wednesday at Maidstone to twelve months further imprisonment with hard labour for an attack on a warder at Borstal Prison; whether he has noted the fact that the prisoner stated that the warder in question habitually kicked the food into the prisoner's cell; and that on resenting this, he, the prisoner, was beaten with staves by warders to an extent which necessitated the bandaging of his arm by the doctor; and whether, in view of this particular case, and of the frequent attacks on warders at, and attempted escapes from, Borstal during the last few years, he will order an inquiry into the whole question of the conduct of Borstal Prison.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): With regard to the first allegation to which the hon. Member refers, inquiry was made at the time and no reason was found for believing what the convict said as to the manner in which his food was served to him. As a matter of fact, the warder he assaulted was not in charge of his cell and did not serve his dinner. The convict's second allegation is incorrect. When brought into the prison after arrest he complained of pain in his arm, and a cold-water bandage was applied by the medical officer; but the injury, if any, was caused in the struggle to stop the assault and effect the arrest, and had nothing to do with the service of his food. Assaults on prison warders are unfortunately inevitable incidents of any large convict establishment where large bodies of criminals—many of them violent and desperate men—have to be kept in association under the control of a small body of warders. The assault to which the hon. Member refers was a murderous one, and could only be properly dealt with by being brought before a Judge of Assize. Though the situation of Borstal makes the number of attempts by convicts to escape somewhat larger than at other prisons, the reports of violence by convicts during the last ten years have been fewer there than at other convict prisons, and in my opinion no inquiry into the discipline is called for. I am satisfied that the administration of the prison is well-conducted.

SIR ERNEST FLOWER (Bradford, W.): Was this convict at Borstal one of the special starred class?

*MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: I cannot say, but I will get the information.

Birmingham Mint and Silver Coinage for the Crown Colonies.

MR. BAYLEY (Derbyshire, Chesterfield): I beg to ask the Secretary of the Treasury what amount of silver coinage for the Crown Colonies has recently been struck at the Mint, Birmingham, and for what Colonies; and whether any commission has been paid on the above coinage to the Crown Agents for the Colonies.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH, Derbyshire, W.): No silver coinage for the Crown Colonies has been struck at the Mint, Birmingham, for upwards of four years.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): Has any commission been paid to the Crown Agents?

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH: No. Sir. No coinage has been struck.

MR. MARKHAM: Not copper coinage?

[No Answer was returned.]

Fraudulent Whisky.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will consider the advisability of in future separating in the annual Revenue Returns the quantities of pot-still whisky distilled in Ireland and Scotland as distinguished from patent spirits distilled in Ireland, Scotland, and England, with a view to facilitating the work of inspectors in prosecuting under the Food and Drugs Act the owners of tied houses who fraudulently compel their tenants to sell English patent spirit as genuine Irish and Scotch whisky.

Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH: The Returns of the Inland Revenue Department do not distinguish between pot-still and patent-still spirit, the difference being one that has no bearing upon the levying of duty; nor do I think that such information, even if obtainable in future, would facilitate identification of spirits after they have left the control of the Inland Revenue and when they are on sale by retailers.

Mr. MACVEAGH: Am I to understand that the Government actually do nothing to prevent the sale of English patent spirit as Scotch or Irish whisky?

[No Answer was returned.]

Whisky in Bond.

Mr. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if all home made spirits, whether Irish whisky, Scotch whisky, blended whisky, patent spirits made in Scotland, Ireland, or England, are permitted as plain British spirit; if the nature of the contents of all casks in bonded warehouses are known to the Revenue officials; and, if so, will he consider the desirability of stating on the permits which are attached by the officials to all casks leaving bond what the contents actually are.

Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH: The Answer to the first paragraph of the hon. Member's Question is in the affirmative and to the second in the negative. Accordingly, the third point mentioned by him does not arise.

Forest Gate Barrack School.

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he is aware that the West Ham Board of Guardians propose to purchase from the Poplar Guardians for the accommodation of the children at present housed in the West Ham Workhouse Schools, the already condemned barrack school at Forest Gate; and if he can give an assurance that such a step will not receive the sanction of the Local Government Board.

The SECRETARY to the LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. Grant Lawson, Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk): I understand that the West Ham Guardians have been in communication with the Poplar Guardians on this subject, but I have not at present had to determine whether the proposed purchase should be sanctioned. If an application for sanction should be made to me I will give the matter careful consideration before arriving at a decision with regard to it.

Mr. LOUGH: Can the purchase be made without the sanction of the Local Government Board?

Mr. GRANT LAWSON: No, Sir.

Wages in the Post Office—Report of the Bradford Committee.

Mr. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether the Bradford Wages Commission Report will be laid upon the Table of the House before the 15th July.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton): I propose to lay the Report of the Bradford Committee on the Table of the House on Friday.

Irish Degree of Bachelor of Arts.

Mr. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the total number of candidates from the Queen's Colleges of Belfast, Cork, and Galway, and Magee College, Derry, who have taken the degree of B.A. at the Royal University during the past five years; and the total number from Kelvin House, Belfast, who have done so during the same period.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Wyndham, Dover): I have communicated this information to the hon. Member. It will also be printed with to-day's Votes.

Queen's College, Belfast.

*Mr. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the cost of the mosaics in the entrance hall of Queen's College, Belfast, and in the library, and of the organ placed in the examination hall; and whether, in view of the demand for further funds for science teaching and original research, he can state from what fund the cost of the mosaics and organ was defrayed.

Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH: The pavement (not mosaic) of the entrance hall and library cost £29, charged to the Vote for the maintenance of the College. The organ was presented to the College by a Belfast family.

Queen's College, Belfast, Scholarships.

*Mr. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state if any scholarships have lapsed in Queen's College, Belfast, during the past ten years; and, if so, whether he can state their value and to what purpose the money thus accruing has been applied.

Mr. WYNDHAM: Occasionally scholarships are not awarded at Belfast College, as in the case of all Colleges and Universities. There is no available information of the number and value of such scholarships. The disposal of monies accruing through their non-award is strictly regulated by the College statutes.

*Mr. MACVEAGH: Is the reason because there are not sufficient capable students?

Mr. WYNDHAM: That is one of the reasons.

Estates Commissioners—Inspectors.

Mr. JOSEPH DEVLIN (Kilkenny, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the number of inspectors employed under the Estates Commissioners, the provinces from which they have been taken; and whether, without exception, they are Protestants.

Mr. WYNDHAM: There are twenty-two inspectors on the staff of the Estates Commissioners, all of whom had previously been employed as assistant land commissioners. Eleven resided in Ulster at the time of their appointment as inspectors; seven in Leinster, and four in Munster. The Estates Commissioners have no knowledge of their religious denominations.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that a Parliamentary Return has been issued, giving a list of the Commissioners, and that in each case the religion is stated?

Mr. WYNDHAM: I am not aware of that.

Mr. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): If the religion is stated in the Return how is it the information has not been supplied to the right hon. Gentleman?

Mr. WYNDHAM: I am not aware that it is so stated.

Lettir (Kerry) School.

Mr. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that in consequence of delay in producing the new plans for school building and of the poverty of the district, the work of erecting a school in Lettir, county Kerry, has been in abeyance for a number of years; and whether, in view of these circumstances, the National Board will contribute something more than the usual two-thirds of the cost, and thereby enable the manager to build a school under the old plans in accordance with the claims of the parents.

Mr. WYNDHAM: In this case the manager elected to postpone the erection of a school-house pending a decision on the question of the revision of the plans and estimates. The Commissioners offered to make a grant under the old regulations in March, 1902. They have no power to make a grant exceeding two-thirds of the estimated cost.

Keelnabrach School, Kerry.

Mr. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the manager of the Keelnabrach School at Glenbeigh, county Kerry, reported to the National Board that the loft was in a dangerous condition, and applied for a grant to build a new school in December, 1902; can he state why the grant was not given; and on whom the responsibility will rest in case an accident occurs, consequent on the condition of the present school building.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The manager applied for a grant for a new school-house. The Commissioners were prepared to make a grant under the old regulations, but he elected to await the issue of the expected new regulations. It is for the manager and other persons interested to adopt such precautions as may be needful for the safety of the children in attendance at the school. No responsibility in this respect attaches to the Commissioners.

Teaching of the Irish Language in Irish Schools.

Captain DONELAN (Cork County, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the fact that the teaching of Irish has been admitted into the ordinary programme in Irish national schools, the special payments which were made when it was taught as a special subject will still be given.

Mr. WYNDHAM: Special fees are paid for instruction in Irish as an extra subject *outside* school hours. The teaching of Irish during school hours in accordance with the programme issued in April last is no bar to the payment of such special fees.

Case of Constable Anderson.

Mr. JOSEPH DEVLIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will furnish the hon. Member for East Mayo with a certified copy of the evidence taken during the Court of inquiry into the charges against Constable Anderson, at Kiltimagh, in December last.

The following Question on the same subject also appeared on the Paper—

Mr. JOSEPH DEVLIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will lay upon the Table a copy of all Correspondence which has passed between the Government authorities in Dublin and Mr. Maurice, the solicitor for Constable Anderson, since the holding of the Court of inquiry in December last.

Mr. WYNDHAM: There is no precedent, so far as I can discover, for laying the proceedings of a Court of inquiry, or an appeal made to the Inspector-General by a solicitor on behalf of his client. I see grave objections to creating such a precedent and am not prepared to do so.

Mr. JOSEPH DEVLIN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that there is no precedent also for the condition of things that exists in connection with this case?

[No Answer was returned.]

Irish Salt Firkin Butter Industry.

Mr. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the number of prosecutions, with the result, which have been instituted in Ireland for excessive moisture in salt firkin butter, where the analysis showed it did not exceed 20 per cent., since the Committee of last session, to whom the Butter Bill was referred, agreed to allow a maximum of 20 per cent. in salt firkin butter; and whether, seeing that the Butter Bill introduced this session contains the same provision, he will call the attention of the Irish Board of Agriculture and the police, acting as food inspectors, to the matter.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The number and results of such prosecutions are not officially recorded, and to obtain the information it would be necessary to communicate with the police throughout Ireland. Under existing statutory regulations where the proportion of water in butter exceeds 16 per cent., it is presumed, until the contrary is proved, that the butter is not genuine. The Department of Agriculture is aware of the proposal in the Bill referred to, to exempt Irish salt firkin butter from the 16 per cent. limit. But the hon. Member is doubtless aware that the Council of Agriculture by a majority of forty-seven votes to seven recently adopted a resolution to the effect that any such exemption, if made, would most injuriously affect the reputation of Irish butter generally. The Kerry County Council has also passed a somewhat similar resolution.

Mr. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that on the 21st of last month a prosecution was instituted against a man at Pallas Grean for having 18 per cent. of moisture in his butter, and that the magistrates on the bench unanimously dismissed it?

Mr. WYNDHAM: I am aware that the case was dismissed on a technical point. I am also aware that a certain number of hon. Members representing certain districts in Ireland hold an opinion contrary to that held by a large number of hon. Members representing other parts of Ireland in regard to the question of moisture in butter—a question which I think can only be settled by legislation.

Mr. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether the Consultative Board of the Agricultural Association—Sir H. Plunkett's Department—are trying to override the decision?

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member is now arguing the matter.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the Limerick County Council and certain district councils have passed resolutions in favour of exempting salt butter from——?

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. FLAVIN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the object of the circular of the Board of Agriculture is to deliberately kill the salt firkin butter trade?

*Mr. SPEAKER: That is not in order.

Mr. FLAVIN: Nothing but creameries will do for Sir Horace Plunkett. I promise the right hon. Gentleman he will hear more of this.

Donegal Homespuns.

Mr. HUGH LAW: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the sale both in this country and abroad of machine-made cloths of inferior quality as Donegal homespuns; and whether any steps are being taken to put a stop to this practtice.

Mr. WYNDHAM: Such sales would seem to constitute an offence against the Merchandise Marks Act, 1887, and if any specific cases of the kind are brought under the notice of the Department, it will be prepared to take such action as it may be advised.

Salters' Company's Trust at Magherafelt.

Mr. JOSEPH DEVLIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that in 1899 the Salters' Company of London conveyed to certain trustees in Magherafelt, county Derry, the old Court-house and bridewell, the markets, and certain other property to hold in trust for the town of Magherafelt upon certain conditions; and that apart from an annual payment of £120 to two local schools and the handing over £100 to the Magherafelt Gas Company, no other disbursements have been made by the trustees; and whether, in view of the desire of the inhabitants that the money in the hands of the trustees should be spent for the benefit and improvement of the town, a local inquiry will be ordered in order to ascertain the conditions under which the trust was made over, its present value, and the best means of securing that it shall be administered for the benefit, and according to the wish, of the people of Magherafelt.

Mr. WYNDHAM: As far as I have been able to ascertain, the Salters' Company assigned certain property to trustees to be used for certain purposes. This trust has been faithfully carried out. I have no power whatever to institute such an inquiry as suggested, or to compel owners of property to dedicate it to purposes other than those to which they desire to devote it.

Collierstown Evicted Tenant.

Mr. SHEEHY (Meath, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether an evicted tenant, Frederick Morres, applied to the Estates Commissioners to be reinstated in his holding in Collierstown, county Meath; whether the farm is untenanted; and what steps, if any, have the Commissioners taken to meet his application.

MR. WYNDHAM: An application has been received from this evicted tenant, and will be considered by the Estates Commissioners.

Bangor (County Down) Post Office.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that discontent exists amongst the inhabitants of Bangor, county Down, with the post office accommodation there; and that representations have already been made to the postal authorities complaining of the inconvenience caused to the residents owing to the limited proportions of the present post office; and whether, in view of the needs of this growing community in the matter of post office accommodation, immediate steps will be taken to have a new building erected.

LORD STANLEY: A representation was made early this year upon this subject by the Urban District Council of Bangor (county Down), when I pointed out to them that the office was provided as recently as 1901, and that the accommodation was still ample to meet the requirements of the public at normal times. I do not consider that a new office is necessary at present.

Transvaal Administration.

DR. MACNAMARA: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can state when and how His Majesty's Government propose to give practical effect to the reply of the Colonial Secretary, on 20th May, to the Resolutions against Chinese labour of both branches of the Federal Legislature of the Commonwealth of Australia, namely, that His Majesty's Government adhere to the policy of treating the Transvaal as a self-governing colony so far as its internal affairs are concerned where Imperial interests are not involved.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): The policy to which the hon. Gentleman refers has been adhered to in the past and is being adhered to at the present.

DR. MACNAMARA: Do I understand that the Transvaal is at the present time a self-governing colony?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, Sir; that has never been asserted by the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

DR. MACNAMARA: Will the right hon. Gentleman look at the despatch of 20th May, where the Colonial Secretary specifically makes that statement?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: A self-governing colony? I think the hon. Gentleman is mistaken.

DR. MACNAMARA: I would ask the right hon. Gentleman whether his attention has been called to the despatch of 20th May, in which the Colonial Secretary says, "His Majesty's Government adhere to the policy of treating the Transvaal as a self-governing colony."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: From that sentence it is clear that it is not a self-governing colony.

MR. MARKHAM: Will the Prime Minister wire to the Government of Australia to send to this House——

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! That does not arise on this Question.

MR. MARKHAM: I think, Sir, you will see that it does, if you allow me to finish the Question.

MR. SPEAKER: I am quite sure that it does not.

The Colonial Office Vote.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can now state definitely when the Colonial Office Vote will be taken.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he could not fix a date for the Colonial Vote, but he would give as long notice of any arrangement as he could.

Sir HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.) reminded the right hon. Gentleman that that Bench had asked that the Colonial Vote might be taken on Thursday, the 21st inst.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I think the right hon. Gentleman has put his supplementary Question under a misapprehension. Neither I nor the Bench opposite can foresee with certainty the course of business in the next few days. If the request is repeated when it can be foreseen, it will be treated, as I have always treated requests from that quarter, with the utmost consideration.

Education (Defaulting Authorities) Bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, instead of proceeding with the Education (Defaulting Authorities) Bill, he will consider the advisability of introducing a short measure giving to England and Wales the same conditions of popular control as are provided in the Scotch Education Bill.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The popular control given in Scotland to the local authorities carried with it, as one of its essential elements, the right to give out of the rates denominational education in school hours in what in England are provided schools. As I understand, the Opposition have scouted the idea of denominational religion being taught within school hours even at the cost of the denomination, and as I further understand the sole ground, if there be a ground, for passive resistance, is that it is alleged that under the existing Act denominational education is given at the cost of the rates. Therefore, if the Scotch system were introduced into England, it is manifest it would offend the Opposition as an organised body of public opinion, and it would do nothing to conciliate passive resisters.

Dr. MACNAMARA: May I ask the Prime Minister why Scotland is always to be treated as an educationally favoured nation?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: If it be an educational favour to a nation to have denominational religion taught out of the rates, that is a privilege I shall be glad to extend to this country.

Mr. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the educational privilege that every community shall have a popularly-governed school in its area?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: It depends on what conditions. The full popular control given in Scotland is, I understand, repulsive to the right hon. Gentleman's conscientious convictions.

Mr. BRYCE again rose, but——

*Mr. SPEAKER said he really thought this debate, for such it was becoming, must be continued on some other occasion.

Mr. BRYCE said he merely desired to make an explanation—namely, that he disclaimed the interpretation of the right hon. Gentleman.

Army Reform—The Secretary for War's Statement.

Sir A. HAYTER (Walsall) asked on what Vote the Secretary for War would make his statement on Army Reform?

The PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY of the TREASURY (Sir A. Acland-Hood, Somersetshire, Wellington) said the statement of the Secretary of State for War to-morrow would be made on the War Office Vote, that being the desire, he understood, of hon. Members opposite. He hoped it would be possible to take Vote 8 afterwards, but he expected the discussion on the statement would occupy a considerable time.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): There are one or two points on that which I desire to put to the First Lord of the Treasury. Will the statement of the Secretary of State for War affect the question of the organisation of the War Office as well as the question of the organisation of the Army, which are two quite distinct matters? I have on many occasions, with the assent of the right hon. Gentleman opposite, requested that a delay should take place before the House is called upon either to pronounce its opinion or even to discuss the statement of the Secretary of State for War. The subject-matter of the statement must occupy a good deal of time, and I think it is only reasonable that there should be an opportunity for a full and well-informed discussion on the matter.

SIR A. HAYTER: As the Militia may be affected, could not that Vote be put down to enable a discussion on a later day.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I quite agree with the right hon. Gentleman that it would be unreasonable to ask the House to confine the discussion of the statement of my right hon. friend to to-morrow alone. A second opportunity must clearly be granted. I do not think it would be desirable that that second discussion should be taken under conditions which might restrict its area and limit the field with which the Secretary of State might have to deal to-morrow. I cannot answer the right hon. Gentleman's Question as to the exact ambit of my right hon. friend's statement. I do not know whether he will refer in detail to War Office re-organisation, though I think it is exceedingly probable that he will refer to it. I think, however, I ought not to make any statement on that matter in the absence of my right hon. friend.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham) asked whether there would be another opportunity this session?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Oh, of course.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: An early opportunity?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Now observe. I am told that, under pains and penalties of all sorts, I must give an early opportunity for the discussion of the Colonial Vote, and now I am asked to give an early opportunity for the discussion of this matter. I will do my best, but I cannot do more.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Mr. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection: That they had discharged the following Members from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures:—Mr. Baird and Mr. Hunter Craig, and had appointed in substitution, Mr. Seymour Ormsby-Gore and Mr. Edward Mitchell.

Report to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL [4th ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 5.

Amendment again proposed—

"In page 3, line 27, to leave out Sub-section (2)."—(*Mr. Levy.*)

Question again proposed, "That the words of Sub-section (2) to the word 'appointed,' in page 3, line 28, stand part of the clause."

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL (Sir EDWARD CARSON, Dublin University) explained that the delegation of powers by quarter sessions was the most convenient method of carrying out the functions of the county licensing committee abolished by the last clause. The power of appointment would be with quarter sessions, and there was no intention to interfere with that power; the Home Secretary would only make the rules under which the justices to whom the duties would be delegated would act as a standing committee. There seemed to be an idea that the Home Secretary was being given too wide powers in connection with the appointment of the committee. That was not so. He would only be able to lay down rules regulating the appointment; the actual appointment itself would be left to quarter sessions.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping) hoped that the hon. Member would not persist in pressing the Amendment. In early parts of the debate hon. Gentlemen opposite had found fault with the Government for limiting the discretion of the justices in quarter sessions yet now they were asking the House to accept an Amendment which would prevent them handing over their business to a committee of men who would probably be experts, and consequently thoroughly well qualified to deal with licensing matters. He noted that hon. Members opposite were by no means agreed on this point.

MR. LEVY (Leicestershire, Loughborough) asked leave to withdraw the Amendment but it was refused.

MR. GALLOWAY (Manchester, S. W.) thought the Amendment if carried would bring about a worse state of affairs than now existed, by subjecting the whole quarter sessions bench to pressure from political quarters with regard to the grant and renewal of licences. It was most desirable to avoid the introduction of Party politics.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs), rising to a point of order, asked, was not the question simply whether the Amendment should be withdrawn?

*THE CHAIRMAN said several of the right hon. Gentleman's supporters having refused to allow the withdrawal, the discussion necessarily proceeded.

MR. GALLOWAY asked what would be the effect of the acceptance of the Amendment?

SIR EDWARD CARSON: The quarter sessions will alone operate.

MR. J. F. HOPE (Sheffield, Brightside) said he wished to put one Question to the hon. and learned Gentleman.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) said, if it was competent for him to do so, he moved that the Question be now put.

*THE CHAIRMAN did not accept the Motion.

MR. J. F. HOPE asked why the first part of the sub-section was optional and the second part mandatory?

SIR EDWARD CARSON replied that in the opinion of the Government, the subsidiary duties mentioned ought to be delegated to the committee.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 193; Noes, 123. (Division List No. 226.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt Hn. Sir H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Campbell, J. H. M. (Dublin Univ.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Colomb, Rt. Hon. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Sir E. W. (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Heath, James (Staffords, N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Rt. Hn H. Somers't, E
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William

Colonel Lockwood.

Hoult, Joseph
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Kennaway, Rt.Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T.(Denbigh)
Kerr, John
Kimber, Henry
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks., N.R.
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col.CharlesW.(Evesham)
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W.F.
Maxwell,Rt.Hn.SirH.E(Wigt'n
Maxwell, W.J.H. (Dumfriessh.)
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Milvain, Thomas
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nolan, Col. John P.(Galway,N.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Peel, Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, Hon. M.W.(Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel,Sir HarryS.(Limehouse
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur(Ormskirk)
Stanley, Edward Jas.(Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord(Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E(Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G.E.(Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H.(Yorks.)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Young, Samuel
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Asher, Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Ellice,Capt E.C(SAndrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Flynn, James Christopher
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt.Hon.Sir E. (Berwick)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol,E.)
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Kennedy,Vincent P.(Cavan,W.
Kilbride, Denis
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William J.(Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Doherty, William
O'Dowd, John
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Reid, Sir R. Threshie(Dumfries
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)

Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Soares, Ernest J.
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Woodhouse, Sir J.T(Huddersf'd

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Levy and Dr. Hutchinson.

MR. WORSLEY-TAYLOR (Lancashire, Blackpool) moved that the rules governing the appointment of committees should be made by quarter sessions, subject to approval by the Secretary of State. He thought that, having regard to the large powers entrusted to quarter sessions, there was no reason why they should not formulate their own rules.

Amendment proposed——

"In page 3, line 29, after the word 'made,' to insert the words 'by them to be approved by a Secretary of State.'"—(*Mr. Worsley-Taylor.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR EDWARD CARSON said the Government did not think the matter a very important one. If there was any feeling among hon. Members that these rules should be made by quarter sessions rather than by the Home Secretary, he would have no objection. He would say, however, that as the great majority of the rules under the Bill must necessarily be made by the Home Secretary, and as it was of great importance to have some kind of similarity in the various rules, he doubted whether there was any advantage in making the change. Still, if the hon. Member thought it worth while pressing the Amendment he would not oppose it.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.) pointed out that the county licensing committee, although appointed and regulated by statute, had power to make rules regarding their procedure, and surely it was not unreasonable to ask that a body like the quarter sessions should have similar power. If it was desired to lay down universal rules as to the constitution of the committee, it should be done in the Bill itself. There was too much legislation attempted by Government Departments at present.

SIR ROBERT REID (Dumfries Burghs) said he preferred the Bill as it stood. The point was a small one and they had better pass to other questions in the consideration of which their time could be more usefully occupied.

MR. LLOYD WHARTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon) suggested that quarter sessions should be allowed to make their own rules, provided that they submitted them to the Home Office for approval.

SIR EDWARD CARSON: I accept the Amendment.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) asked if it would be in the power of the quarter sessions to appoint on the committee magistrates interested in the trade.

SIR EDWARD CARSON: No, Sir.

MR. WHITLEY: Thank you.

Question put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 29, after the word 'Act,' to insert the words 'providing for the mode of appointment, number, quorum, and procedure of committees.'" — (*Mr. Worsley Taylor.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 29, after the word 'and,' to insert the words 'except in a county borough.'" — (*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Amendment agreed to.

*MR. HELME (Lancashire, Lancaster) moved to add words excepting also those non-county boroughs which have a separate commission of the peace and a population of over 25,000. He reminded the Committee that on the previous day the Government were good enough to grant powers with regard to new licences to magistrates in non-county boroughs. He now asked them to go a step further. A Committee of hon. Members sitting on both sides of the House had carefully gone into this question, and they found that out of 177 non-county boroughs having a separate commission of the peace there were many too small to have a separate compensation fund. It had therefore been decided to suggest that non-county boroughs with a separate commission of the peace and a population of over 25,000 should be entrusted with the entire control of the licensed houses within their boundaries. It was well understood that actual knowledge of a district was the foundation upon which successful local government was conducted. This was not a Party question, but administrative. It had been suggested that if this Amendment were conceded it would mean taking the gem out of its surroundings, and that the county area would be deprived of large sums which would otherwise be available for compensation. But was it not the fact that it was in the urban district that the overplus of the licensed houses existed, rather than in the county districts? As the House had already accepted the principle of dealing with county boroughs apart from the administrative County areas of which they formed part, so he urged they should also accept the principle that local self government should be conceded to non-county boroughs with regard to licensing. He had put down an amendment to secure a provision for the automatic inclusion of other boroughs as their populations increased to 25,000. He strongly appealed to the Government to accept this Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 29, after the words last inserted, to insert the words 'or a borough having a separate commission of the peace and a population of over twenty-five thousand.'"—(*Mr. Helme.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE hoped the Government before accepting this Amendment would consider the general position of county areas. It was the old story. First the Government made a concession to one class, then another class began to exert pressure, and, if this went on, the whole county area would be whittled away. This was not a question of jurisdiction, it was a question of money. He reminded the Committee that this was a question of administering a fund, and that the county would be left in an unfair position if the Government listened to many appeals for the exclusion of boroughs from the county area. The compensation fund would be largely raised from the boroughs, which the Amendment proposed to exclude from the area. The licensed houses in these boroughs were largely supported by country people. In some old-fashioned market towns there might be a congestion of licensed houses, but as their population did not reach 25,000 they would be left in the area, but there were other non-county boroughs steadily growing and thriving where there was no excess of licensed premises and these were to be taken out of the area. That was where the unfairness came in.

SIR ALBERT ROLLIT (Islington, S.) declared that county boroughs were to enjoy this privilege on the basis of their local knowledge and administration, and he pointed out that there were no less than twelve county boroughs with populations of less than 25,000. Why should not Canterbury, he asked, be treated as an autonomous area, unless, of course, it was because it was in Kent? He reminded the Committee that they had the precedent of the Education Act where the population was fixed at 10,000; and, dealing with the objection that the area would not be sufficient for the purpose of raising an adequate compensation fund, he referred to the unanimous opinion of the non-county borough Members that the area would be sufficient. He hoped the point would be conceded by the Government.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) said that, in his opinion, the Amendment of his hon. friend did not go far enough. He thought that the argument of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Somerset was valid, and that reform was needed in non-county boroughs even more than in the large cities. Although they might not have a superfluity of public-houses, reform was necessary; and, therefore, they ought to be given autonomy. It was rather an arbitrary and unnecessary line that was drawn by his hon. friend in selecting a population of 25,000; and he would later propose that 10,000 be substituted. Under the Education Act autonomy was given to boroughs of that size for the purposes of secondary education. There were a large number of boroughs which felt very bitterly at being deprived of direct control over their own licences. He thought the Government would be well advised to offend as little as possible these important local authorities.

DR. HUTCHINSON (Sussex, Rye) said that difficulties would arise in many boroughs. For instance, part of Tunbridge Wells was in Kent and part in Sussex. It had a very efficient borough bench, and no complaint regarding it had been made. It was very hard that it had in one instance to apply to quarter sessions in Kent and in another instance to quarter sessions in Sussex. Such an anomaly ought to be put an end to. All they wanted was to allow those boroughs to work out their own salvation in their own way.

SIR EDWARD CARSON said it was difficult to draw the line in these cases. There might be no valid reason why a borough with 49,000 inhabitants should be treated differently to a borough with 50,000 inhabitants. But the line had to be drawn. The only question was the provision of a proper compensation area; and it was important that it should not be too small. If it were too small there would not be sufficient funds to effect a desirable reduction of licences. The Government went very carefully into the matter, and were very anxious to meet the views of the borough councils in the matter. The figures, however, showed that, if the Amendment were accepted, the amount of compensation available would in some cases be too small to be effective, while in other cases it would be more than adequate having regard to the existing number of public-houses, and would probably be more than would be used. The latter cases would, however, diminish the effectiveness of the fund in the county at large. Therefore, if the Amendment were accepted, in some cases the compensation area would be too small, and in other cases it would be too large, and it would reduce the fund available for the county generally. The only really feasible and practical way of setting up a compensation fund was by the means proposed in the Bill. Several representations had been made to the Government; and the Government had put back the licensing system in this particular, exactly as it was before. They had gone a step further, and had put down an Amendment providing for the representation of non-county boroughs. It was to insert—

> "In page 4, line 8, after the word 'committees,' to insert the words 'of quarter sessions and for the constitution of those committees where requisite as standing committees, and also for the addition to those committees in the case of a county, of representatives of the justices of any boroughs within the county not being county boroughs, but having a separate commission of the peace.'"

That would, he thought, meet the desire of the non-county boroughs. He could assure the Committee that the acceptance of the Amendment would render ineffective the compensation fund in many cases.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) said that he was very glad that the Government intended to make some provision for the representation of non-county boroughs. He intended, however, to move an Amendment giving the boroughs a statutory right to representation. If those boroughs were not represented at quarter sessions, the Court would be dealing with areas from which it had on representation. There was nothing in the Amendment mentioned by the Solicitor-General which would give non-county boroughs a claim to representation. Some of the worst cases in the country were the cases of little market towns, many of which had a public-house for every hundred of the population. These houses supplied fairs and markets on certain days, but for the rest they had to be kept going by the local population. If the borough justices had not the right of representation they would not be summoned. The average county justice looked down on the borough justice. He thought the hon. Member for the Ripon Division would agree to that.

Mr. LLOYD WHARTON said he could assure the hon. Gentleman he never looked down on any one.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said it was not always those who had the right who looked down on people. Why should not the Solicitor-General put this right of representation into Clause 5 instead of Clause 6?

Sir EDWARD CARSON said that the Home Secretary would be empowered to make rules; but if the hon. Gentleman did not think that that was sufficient he would be prepared to introduce other words.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said the Amendment which he would suggest was: "When constituting the committee under this section every non-county borough having a separate commission of the peace shall be represented thereon."

Sir EDWARD CARSON: I should like to consider that, and I can assure the hon. Member I will try to meet him on Report.

*Sir JAMES WOODHOUSE (Huddersfield) said there was a very strong feeling on this matter amongst the non-county boroughs because they considered the Bill deprived them of an autonomy they now possessed. They had always exercised the jurisdiction which the Bill sought to dispossess them of. There was no allegation that the magistrates had discharged their duties improperly or imprudently. It was therefore a strong thing on the part of the Government to bring in a Bill to deprive them of the jurisdiction they had. The reason given was that it might affect the distribution of the compensation fund which would be derived from the counties in which they were scheduled, but if there was any argument in that at all, it was in favour of maintaining the existing state of things. If there were redundant licences they would exist in these small boroughs and not in the scattered country districts, and the larger amount of the contribution to the compensation fund in the counties would be derived from these boroughs and not from the other portions of the county. Scarborough, with a population of 33,000, would contribute £2,056 as a non-county borough population, but if the Amendment were agreed to the amount available for the Scarborough Quarter Sessions for compensation would be £773. Whether they were compensated on the basis of the proportion of population, the levy on licences, or on the assessable value, the result would be the same—they would only receive back a third of what they contributed to the fund. Under these circumstances he thought there had been no solid argument for removing from non-county boroughs the jurisdiction they possessed.

Mr. FISON (Yorkshire, W.R., Doncaster) as the representative of a non-county borough thanked the Government for the way in which the non-county boroughs had been treated. In the West Riding of Yorkshire there were a dozen non-county boroughs and he did not see how quarter sessions was to be kept an efficient body if they were constantly adding to their body the representatives of these non-county boroughs. He thought the present appeal from the licensing authorities of the non-county boroughs to the quarter sessions was the most efficient way of dealing with the matter.

*Mr. THEODORE TAYLOR (Lancashire, Radcliffe) hoped the Government would go further than they had done. Knowing something about the small non-county boroughs in the West Riding of Yorkshire, he might say that there were many with over 25,000 inhabitants who would lose their jurisdiction. It was sought by this Amendment to confirm to these boroughs the jurisdiction they had hitherto possessed. At present the borough justices had no title to sit at quarter sessions. True, the Government had at last promised to give them some kind of representation at quarter sessions, but that was not enough. Knowing something of these non-county boroughs, he said the areas were large enough to form a compensation fund and would make a homogeneous area over which the compensation money could be spent. There was a very strong case in Lancashire and Yorkshire for this Amendment, and he put it to the Government it was only fair treatment to mete out to these areas. In his view the borough magistrates had as much right to sit in review at quarter sessions on their own decisions as had county justices. No doubt borough justices were looked down upon as inferior beings, but since the Local Government Act which created every chairman of an urban district council a county magistrate that objection against borough justices no longer held good. He should vote for this Amendment as a very necessary step in devolution. He hoped that, as in the case of other measures, such as the Education Act, the larger non-county boroughs of from 25,000 to 50,000 inhabitants would receive, what he regarded as a mere matter of justice, the consideration to which they were entitled.

SIR EDWARD GREY (Northumberland, Berwick) said that if the Amendment were accepted as it stood it would still leave in their anomalous and unsatisfactory condition some of the smaller non-county boroughs. He was one of those who, in regard to the Education Act, felt the great importance of not confusing the area by making exceptions within it. He saw the force of the Government contention that it was desirable to have a homogeneous and large area for dealing with compensation, but in this case community of interest and feeling would not be established between non-county boroughs and quarter sessions. There was to be no channel of communication between them, and they would be in some cases two almost hostile bodies—he meant hostile in the sense of entirely separate. If this Amendment were not accepted some means must be found of dovetailing one with the other. He was therefore glad to see that the Government had put down an Amendment with regard to representation. He thought the hon. Member opposite who had thanked the Government ought to have reserved his thanks. The Solicitor-General, it was true, hoped to meet this point on Report, but all he had on the Paper was that the Secretary of State "may" make rules. There was not even a direct instruction.

SIR EDWARD CARSON said this expression was always construed as a direction.

SIR EDWARD GREY thought it would be best to frame a direct instruction, and expressed the opinion that the only satisfactory way would be to insert words in Clause 5. He did not doubt the good faith of the right hon. and learned Gentleman, but he could not help his mind going back to what was said with regard to the time limit on the Second Reading, when the right hon. and learned Gentleman thought something might be done in Committee, and how that idea was carried out.

SIR EDWARD CARSON: What I said was that the question of time limit should be considered in Committee.

SIR EDWARD GREY said that the impression created by the remarks of the right hon. and learned Gentleman on the Second Reading of the Bill was that it would not only be considered, but considered with a view of admitting it into the Bill, but that there were difficulties in the way. The Bill was, however, being discussed under certain restrictions which might cause those difficulties to be disposed of somewhat summarily on Report.

MR LLOYD WHARTON thought the Opposition were showing a certain lack of gratitude inasmuch as representatives were to be introduced from boroughs which had never been represented before.

* MR. HIGHAM (Yorkshire, W.R., Sowerby) pointed out that hon. Members who opposed this Amendment were, to some extent, defeating their own purpose. It was contended that the Amendment would take out of the county area such an amount of value as would deprive the county of a large amount of its worth. But in non-county boroughs at the present time there was an exceedingly strong feeling against the deprivation to which they were subjected, and the feeling was so operating as to cause the non-county boroughs to force themselves into the position of county boroughs. In Accrington, one of the largest non-county boroughs in Lancashire, there

was a very strong feeling that this work should be left to them. For years they had felt that the appeals to quarter sessions were really against them, and if the larger non-county boroughs were left out of the Bill the present feeling would be intensified. Under the proposal of the Government the boroughs of Nelson, with a population of 35,000, Accrington with a population of 45,000, and Darwen with a population of 40,000, would be in the position of children, and he appealed to the Government to consider the position of such non-county boroughs. It would be an easy matter for these non-county boroughs to add surrounding districts to their area, and the counties would then be deprived of a greater amount of value still. In the towns which he had mentioned much of the opposition to the Bill arose from the fact that they were being excluded from its action, and the opposition even of extreme temperance men would be greatly lessened by such a concession as that embodied in the Amendment.

*LIEUTENANT-COLONEL PRYCE-JONES (Montgomery Boroughs) drew attention to the fact that quarter sessions were represented by a large number of magistrates, many of whom did not reside in the district, whereas in the case of borough magistrates they did usually reside in the district. That fact, he thought, was a very strong argument why they should have a voice upon the committee appointed by the quarter sessions to consider licensing appeals. He had the honour to represent six boroughs, four of which had separate commissions of the peace. He made a strong appeal to the Government to include these boroughs. He did not see why all of them should not be represented, and he would support any proposal which would have that result.

MR. TREVELYAN said he felt bound to move an Amendment to this Amendment. He was not at all satisfied with what the Government had said in regard to non-county boroughs. Many of the smaller non-county boroughs were as important as those having 25,000 of population, and on their behalf he would move to substitute 10,000 for 25,000 in the Amendment. There were many boroughs in Yorkshire under the limit of the Amendment, which were as much deserving of consideration as those large non-county boroughs which had been mentioned. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out the words 'twenty-five' and insert the word 'ten.'"—(*Mr. Trevelyan*).

Question proposed, "That the words 'twenty-five' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

MR. NUSSEY (Pontefract), as representing one of the smallest county boroughs in the West Riding of Yorkshire, supported the Amendment. Non-county boroughs which had had a separate commission of the peace for many years felt they were being badly treated in the Bill. In the borough of Pontefract the magistrates had protested most strongly against the proposal of the Government to merge these smaller boroughs into the counties. He recognised the difficulty which would be placed upon the Government if this Amendment were accepted, because, if they made the area too small, in a great many cases the fund for compensation would be too small to be of much use. There were some small non-county boroughs, such as Newmarket, which were in two counties. What would be done with them? Would they be given two representatives, or none at all? He thought the simple way would be to allow every one of these small boroughs to manage its own affairs. They would have ample funds at their disposal in most cases to deal with any reasonable reduction of licences. He hoped the Government would recognise the claim of these old non-county boroughs and give them fair and just consideration under the Bill.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.) said he desired to support the Amendment moved by his hon. friend behind him on the ground that 25,000 was too high. The hon. Member for Ripon seemed to think that there were a very small number of boroughs under 25,000 with separate commissions of the peace. That might be so in the North of England but was not the case in the West of England. In the large county of Somerset there was not one single borough which would be included by this 25,000 limit. It seemed ridiculous that a borough which had the right to send a Member to Parliament should have no right of representation under this clause. He was sure the Home Secretary would recognise that there was a very strong feeling indeed in small non-county boroughs not only with a population of 25,000 but of 10,000 and under, that they did not like to be treated in this way. What would happen under this Bill was that the autonomy of the small non-county boroughs would be destroyed. He supported the area being 10,000 under the Education Act, and therefore he was absolutely consistent in this matter. As regarded the licensing question, it was only fair and right that there should be local self-government in the fullest sense. He certainly hoped his hon. friend would press this Amendment to a division, and he could assure the Committee that as regarded the West of England there was a strong feeling that the 25,000 limit was not of the slightest advantage to them.

MR. WORSLEY-TAYLOR hoped the Government would not accept the Amendment. He was one of those who habitually sat at quarter sessions, and he ventured to think that if this Amendment were accepted it would go far to create very great difficulty in the administration of the Act. In the county of Lancashire there was a population of 4,300,000, and of that number 2,500,000 were in county boroughs, leaving 1,800,000 for the rest of the administrative county. So far as he could see from the census, there were no less than fourteen of these non-county boroughs, having separate sessions which had populations of 25,000 and over. The total population of these fourteen non-county boroughs with over 25,000 inhabitants was about 480,000. Therefore the result was that there would be taken out of the administrative county for the purpose of the compensation fund that figure of 480,000, leaving 1,300,000 instead of 1,800,000, and there would be in that county fourteen different sets of authorities for the purpose of the compensation fund. He thought as a matter of economical administration that it would be vastly better for the 1,800,000 and for the purposes of raising the compensation fund that they should be dealt with generally.

*MR. EMMOTT (Oldham) appealed to the hon. Member for Elland to withdraw his Amendment, because it seemed to him to bring the whole question to a ridiculous point, and he was perfectly certain that there was not a ghost of a chance of it being carried. With regard to the other Amendment dealing with areas having a separate commission of the peace and 25,000 inhabitants, he thought a very strong case could be made out for it. He had not been convinced by the figures of the hon. Member opposite. If these boroughs were taken out of the county, the county only lost money; but the boroughs lost much more than money by being retained. Many of them were not *ejusdem generis* with the county around them. These boroughs hated the interference of quarter sessions because they were often a different class of population altogether, and they felt that the county justices did not understand the requirements of their localities. It was admitted that in some cases they lost financially, whilst in others they gained. He thought a very strong case had been made out for the Amendment inserting 25,000, and he hoped the hon. Member for Elland would withdraw his proposal in regard to boroughs of 10,000.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) said the argument of the last speaker showed exactly the same distrust of quarter sessions. These boroughs had their ancient institutions and a history older than that of quarter sessions, and consequently they did not like being interfered with by an outside body. Now the privilege they had enjoyed so long was going to be taken away from them and placed in the hands of quarter sessions. What they wanted was that all communities should work together. If they made one community jealous of another they would cause great trouble and difficulty in the working of this Bill, and he did not see how it could be avoided. If they took away certain powers from small boroughs and handed them over to quarter sessions how could they expect the local magistrates to work cordially with quarter sessions. Nothing was more likely to irritate or hurt their feelings than to have their powers taken away and handed over to quarter sessions. There might be a possibility of the fund being rather small, but they might give them the option of being included in the quarter sessions area if they wished it. That would prevent all friction and it would make this part of the Bill work smoothly. He hoped the Government would refrain from imposing these irritating restrictions upon small communities.

MR. PYM (Bedford) thought they ought to feel grateful to the Government for the concessions they had made on this point. When he came to consult his borough sessions and borough magistrates he could not say whether they would be satisfied or not. At any rate they had advanced in the direction of giving these smaller areas a certain independence which under the Bill as it stood before they did not have. He thought the suggestion to insert 10,000 might be objected to on the ground that boroughs of 10,000 would not have a sufficient number of magistrates to be able to divide them to sit in two Courts. He doubted whether the small boroughs would be sufficiently large to raise an adequate compensation fund for the purpose of reducing the number of licences. On the other hand, he thought 25,000 was sufficiently large for the purposes he had mentioned, and he hoped the Government would favourably consider this suggestion, because this was a matter upon which boroughs of 25,000 inhabitants felt very strongly. Hon. Members knew perfectly well the strong feeling of jealousy which existed in some of these old boroughs, and nothing had brought the feeling out more strongly than the creation of the county councils. The interference of the county council with his borough would be like holding out a red rag to a bull. Why should they do this? If these old boroughs had a sufficiently large area and sufficient magistrates to carry out the intention of the Bill, why should they not be given this independent power? He hoped the Government would give a favourable consideration to this point. On this matter he desired to support the true interests of the borough he represented.

MR. WALLACE (Perth) said he would be disposed to support the Amendment of his hon. friend if he thought there was any chance of its being adopted, but in the circumstances he hoped it would not be pressed, because he thought if it was pressed it would not be carried, while it would endanger the acceptance of an Amendment with regard to the larger boroughs which was desired by both sides of the House. He agreed with his hon. friend as to the strong feeling in the small boroughs with regard to the preservation of their rights. In Scotland there was nothing more prized than the powers possessed by local magistrates to deal with licensing matters. The local magistrates discharged their duties in a way which gave almost universal satisfaction. He thought the same result would take place in England. None of the difficulties which might arise in the smaller boroughs could arise in the larger boroughs of over 25,000 inhabitants. He was quite sure that it would create great jealousy amongst the smaller boroughs if they discriminated between them, giving representation on quarter sessions to some and denying it to others. He hoped that, in carrying out the pledge given, the hon. and learned Member would try to see that all these boroughs had the same representation on the licensing authority.

VISCOUNT MORPETH (Birmingham, S.) said hon. Members on the Opposition side of the House seemed to have forgotten the nature of the Bill with which they were dealing. It was a Bill for the encouragement of temperance. Hon. Members on the other side of the House laughed. They had been advocating temperance, and had continually said that the proper way of dealing with this subject was to have a national levy over the whole country for the purposes of compensation, and now they were busily engaged helping the smaller boroughs to limit the very small and inadequate fund to be provided for the purposes of this Bill. The Committee had been told by hon. Members opposite about the prestige of the borough magistrates. They had been told that certain things must not be done because of the interference with the dignity and prestige of the borough magistrates. He did not admit that there was such a feeling as hon. Members had alluded to; but assuming that there was this feeling, it seemed to him that the best way to get over it was to adopt the Amendment proposed by his right hon. friend the Home Secretary. He looked at this matter purely from the point of view of how they were going to help in the reduction of licences. He held that they would help in the reduction of licences by making the areas of adequate size. The congestion was not the same all over the country. It was worse in some districts than in others, and if they were to reduce the number of licences in the most congested districts it was desirable that those areas should be joined to other districts, which would help them out in the matter of reductions. He hoped the Government would stand firm in this matter and not allow the areas they had selected to be whittled away and the effectiveness of the Bill to be in that way lessened.

*SIR JOSEPH LEESE (Lancashire, Accrington) said he could conceive why hon. Members in discussing this question put forward the views which suited their own constituents. He did not quarrel with them for that, but when they brought forward an Amendment to the Amendment on the Paper, which would destroy the possibility of doing a fair measure of justice to the larger boroughs, he thought that policy ought to be deprecated. He regarded the Amendment to the Amendment as absolutely antagonistic to the proposal of his hon. friend the Member for Lancaster. In effect the 10,000 population boroughs said to the larger boroughs: "You shall not have autonomy unless we get it too." The result of giving effect to that view would be that the large boroughs, in which he was specially interested, and those large places which were within 3,000 or 4,000 of being county boroughs, would be kept out of their legitimate rights. He thought the Committee did not know the amount of jealousy that existed between the large non-county boroughs and the county councils. The non-county boroughs found themselves being deprived of their local autonomy step by step. They conceived that they could manage their own affairs as well as the county councils could manage for them. They were indignant at being superseded as educational authorities in their own boroughs, and now they were not to be permitted to control the drink trade in their local districts. He would heartily support the proposal of the hon. Member for Lancaster.

MR. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe) said he happened to be in intimate touch with three boroughs which would be closely affected by the Amendment, if carried. He was a member of the Bench of the borough of Accrington, and he knew the feeling there against the proposals in this Bill. The other boroughs of which he spoke were Darwen and Clitheroe. The whole of these boroughs had sent to him officially, through the town councils and the borough Benches, petitions and resolutions protesting against this proposal. Surely that was the only way, apart from a general election, they hay of obtaining the opinion of the people directly concerned. Here they had opinion directly stated against the action of the Government in this matter. He agreed with the hon Member for Sowerby that to deprive local authorities of the powers which they previously had would do serious injury to the good government of our municipalities. The noble Lord the Member for Birmingham came and told them that this was an unwise proposal. He had better go to the Birmingham Borough Bench and ask them to give up their rights. It was most unfair for hon. Members representing places which had this power to try to prevent others from getting it. He hoped the Government would gracefully consent to the Amendment.

MR. COGHILL (Stoke-upon-Trent) supported the Amendment. He was perfectly certain that the Solicitor-General fully recognised the difficulties underlying this question. He thought the non-county boroughs had a grievance in this respect. He represented three large towns in the Potteries, and the question was peculiarly complicated in relation to them. One town happened to be a county borough, having a population of over 50,000. Naturally the others were jealous of that town. He sympathised with Gentlemen representing the smaller boroughs, but to suggest that boroughs of 10,000 population should be included was going too far in the other direction, unless large boroughs of over 25,000 population were placed in the same position as county boroughs. If these were county boroughs the question would be perfectly simple, but as they were not, it was extremely hard that boroughs with a population of 30,000 or 40,000 should be placed in a distinctly inferior position to that of towns immediately adjoining whose population was just over 50,000. He hoped the Solicitor-General would see his way to going a little further than he had done towards meeting the very strong views which were held on both sides of the House.

MR. GEORGE WHITELEY (Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey) said he had always objected to this grading of boroughs according to population, for, after all, that was a fluctuating standard. They all remembered that when the Local Government Act was passed two classes of boroughs were established — county boroughs with a population of 50,000, and non-county boroughs with a population of less than 50,000. Great soreness was created in the smaller boroughs on account of this distinction, because they were deprived of some of their privileges and placed under the rule of the county councils. The Government were proposing to do exactly the same injustice to the smaller boroughs under this Bill as under the Local Government Act. Now it was proposed to have boroughs under 25,000 population, boroughs between 25,000 and 50,000 population, and county boroughs a class by themselves. It would be better to deal with all the boroughs in the same fashion and give them similar privileges. By the Bill they were going to make confusion worse confounded in local government if this Amendment was not accepted by the Solicitor-General.

MR. HENDERSON (Durham, Barnard Castle) said he wanted to join the hon. Member who had just spoken in support of the Amendment. He could not speak as the representative of a non-county borough; but he had the honour in the present year to be the chief magistrate of a non-county borough with a population of some 45,000. He presided at the annual licensing meeting, when it was unanimously decided to take no action during the present year, having regard to prospective legislation. The other day he called a meeting of the magistrates in order that they might consider the Bill that was proposing this prospective legislation, and, with one exception, they voted in support of a resolution protesting against the destruction of their powers by this Bill, and, therefore, in their name he made an appeal to the Solicitor-General that he would consider the claim of a borough of the size and importance of Darlington, with which he was connected. There was another point which ought to be very carefully kept in mind during the present discussion. The basis of this Bill had been very clearly stated to be the action of the magistrates throughout the country in taking away licences on the ground of non-requirement. Hon. Members would remember that he asked the Home Secretary to give him a Return on this particular matter, and that Return clearly demonstrated that the non-county borough Benches had committed no evil, if any evil had been committed by any Benches. If they had done the least mischief the Government ought to have some regard for the very mild way in which they had exercised their powers in the past, and should not seek by this Bill to take away those powers that they had so mildly put into operation. He appealed to the Solicitor-General whether he could not see his way to accept the Amendment of the hon. Member for Lancaster and allow non-county boroughs of a population of over 25,000 to retain the powers which they had hitherto enjoyed.

SIR EDWARD CARSON said he was most anxious, if he could, to go further than he had already done. But the Government had gone into this question most minutely, and they had deliberately come to the conclusion that this Amendment would spoil the working of the compensation fund. It was, therefore, impossible that he could hold out any hope of going further than he had already done. He had himself gone personally into the figures of all the non-county boroughs—certainly most of those which had more than 25,000 of population, and had a separate commission of the peace—and the conclusion to which he had come was that in some cases there would not be sufficient contributions to the compensation fund to enable the magistrates practically and effectively to deal with the suppression of unnecessary licensed houses. On the other hand, in several boroughs there would be this state of facts—particularly in comparatively new districts where there was a large population—that there would be a very good class of public-house, and practically there would be very little necessity for taking away superabundant houses at all; but, at the same time, there would be a very considerable annual value of contributions to the compensation fund lost to the county, which wanted it badly in connection with some of the small non-county boroughs whose contributions would be very small. It was solely on these grounds that the Government had drawn the line they had done. But they thought they ought to do something for the larger non-county boroughs, and he had undertaken to consider, as far as possible, to have a representation of the non-county boroughs upon quarter sessions; and that he would attempt to carry out to the best of his ability. It had been said over and over again that they were taking away some right from the non-county boroughs. He knew that they were taking it away to this extent, that they would have only the same power to suggest the houses that ought to be suppressed as they now had.

Mr. WHITTAKER (Yorkshire, W.R., Spen Valley): They do not suggest now. They have the power.

Sir EDWARD CARSON said that the hon. Member knew perfectly well the distinction. At the present moment they had not the absolute right of taking away a licence, because there was an appeal to quarter sessions which was exercised in every case.

Mr. WHITTAKER: No; not in half.

Sir EDWARD CARSON said that if the hon. Member would look into the figures he would see that in almost every case, if a licence was taken away for the reason of redundancy, and redundancy alone, there was an appeal to the quarter sessions. Under the Bill the local justices would simply report the house to quarter sessions. But if in any wise the compensation fund was made less adequate than under the Bill, then they would be really interfering more with the power to reduce licensed houses. Therefore, the Government could not accept the Amendment.

*Mr. HELME asked if he might venture just finally to suggest to the Government that in the list of the boroughs presented to them a comparison was made of the amount the compensation fund would amount to calculated for areas in the smaller counties and the smaller county boroughs, and those asked for were sufficiently large. Hence there was no question of principle, as opposed to the Bill, in pressing this Amendment on the Committee. He asked the Government to look at the question as related to such boroughs in Lancashire as were on the edge of becoming county boroughs—such as Blackpool and Southport. These boroughs had very large areas, and at the present moment they were applying to be constituted county boroughs. In fact, they would be county boroughs before this Bill came into operation. Contrast Canterbury, with a population of 15,000, which was a county borough, with Lancaster, the county town, with a population of between 40,000 and 50,000 and with old historic associations for hundreds of years. Why should Lancaster be placed in a position of inferiority to Canterbury? Where was the justice in that, and where was the principle? This was not a Party question. It was undeniable that in the request they had made they were guided by the fact that they knew that the Government had the power to carry the Bill through the House, and they only asked the Government to consider the equities of the case. The fact was they restricted their request to those boroughs which were large enough to provide the compensation. In the interest of the future working of this measure, he would point out that it would be far better if the Home Secretary and Solicitor-General would, before the Report stage, look into this question and bring up a clause which would work better than the one proposed. It might be possible to provide that in some very small boroughs there should be an appeal to quarter sessions. He trusted that in these circumstances the hon. Member for Elland would withdraw his Amendment.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 281; Noes, 130. (Division List No. 227.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arrol, Sir William
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Austin, Sir John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A.J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blake, Edward
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brigg, John
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Campbell, J.H.M. (Dublin Univ.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cawley, Frederick
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Colomb, Rt. Hon. Sir John C.R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)

Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir Soseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Emmott, Alfred
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W).
Fellowes, Hn. Ailwyn Edward
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Sir E. W (B'ryS Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)

Higham, John Sharpe
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Rt Hn H. (Somers't, E
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H
Kerr, John
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Kitson, Sir James
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks., N.R.
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (Accrington)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh, W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, Rt Hn. Sir H. E. (Wigt'n
Maxwell, W.J.H. (Dumfriessh.)
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.

Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Randles, John S.
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridley, Hon. M.W. (Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir Harry S. (Limehouse
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Shackleton, David James
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H. (Renfrew)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col Sir C. E. H. (Sheffield
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walton, Jn. Lawson (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh., N.
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks.)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Huddersf'd
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Young, Samuel
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Pym and Mr. George White.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Asher, Alexander
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Channing, Francis Allston
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Delany, William
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Capt E. C (S Andrw's Bghs
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Evans, Sir Fran. H. (Maidstone)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Garfit, William
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt. Hn. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale
Harwood, George
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W.
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moss, Samuel
Murphy, John
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Reddy, M.
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Rose, Charles Day
Russell, T. W.
Schwann, Charles E.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)

Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas, Sir A.(Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Wallace, Robert
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, JohnCathcart(Orkney)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Trevelyan and Sir Edward Strachey.

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 171; Noes, 246. (Division List No. 228.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Asher, Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Delany, William
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice,Capt E.C(SAndrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans,SirFrancisH.(Maidstone
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Garfit, William
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Greene, Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Grey, Rt.Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Edward Marshall
Harcourt, Lewis V.(Rossendale
Harwood, George
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol,E.)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones,DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy,Vincent P.(Cavan,W.
Kitson, Sir James
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,SirJosephF.(Accrington)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moss, Samuel
Murphy, John
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary,Mid
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Partington, Oswald
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Reddy, M.
Reid, Sir R. Threshie(Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A.(Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas,DavidAlfred(Merthyr)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, JohnLawson(Leeds,S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason,John Cathcart(Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)

Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull,W.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Woodhouse,Sir J.T(Huddersf'd

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Helme and Mr. Pym.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allhusen,Augustus HenryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hn.Sir H.
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt.Hon. A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour,RtHonGeraldW(Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T.(Windsor)
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beach,Rt.Hn.Sir Michael Hicks
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bowles, T.Gibson(King's Lynn
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt.Hn.J.A.(Glasgow
Campbell, J.H.M.(DublinUniv.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain,Rt Hn.J.A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Colomb, Rt. Hn. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Craig,Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.)
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale, Rt.Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland,Sir FredDixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants., W.
Fergusson,RtHn.Sir J.(Manc'r)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster,PhilipS.(Warwick,S.W.)
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gore, Hon. S.F. Ormsby
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene,Sir E.W(B'rySEdm'nds
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A.(Stafford,W.)
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse,RtHnH.(Somers't,E
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Midd.,Tottenham)
Hozier, Hon.James HenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Kerr, John
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson,JohnGrantYorks.,N.R
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col.CharlesW.(Evesham)
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver,Sir Lewis(Edinburgh,W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell,RtHn.Sir H.E(Wigt'n
Maxwell, W.J.H. (Dumfriessh.)
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt.Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
MorganDavidJ.(Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray,RtHonA.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan, Col. JohnP.(Galway,N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Peel, Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Randles, John S.
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon. M.W.(Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel,Sir HarryS.(Limehouse
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H.(Renfrew)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Simeon, Sir Barrington

Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Smith, James Parker(Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Edward Jas.(Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord(Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G(Oxf'dUniv.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.Sir C.E.H(Sheffield
Walker, Col. William Hall
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt-Col.A.C.E(Taunton)
Welby, Sir Charles G.E.(Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh.,N.)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H.(Yorks.)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, RtHon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Young, Samuel
Younger, William

Tellers for the Noes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

*Mr. SLACK (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) moved to insert a provision enabling any person entitled to be heard by the committee of quarter sessions to appear and be heard by counsel or solicitor. He submitted that such a provision was necessary in view of the complicated terms of the present measure and the difficulties of interpreting the licensing law of this country. Solicitors as well as counsel were included in the Amendment not only in order to minimise the expense, but also because solicitors had no right of audience at quarter sessions, and might therefore be held to have no right of audience before a committee of quarter sessions. Solicitors were now heard at brewster sessions and many of the powers of brewster sessions now in reality or in effect passed to the committees referred to in this section. It was essential that those members of the local public who desired to be heard in opposition to, or in support of, a licence-application as well as an aggrieved licence-holder should unmistakably have the right to legal assistance and the services of a trained advocate before these committees.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 32, after the word 'Act,' to insert the words 'and any person entitled to be heard by such committee may appear and be heard by counsel or solicitor on his behalf.'"—(*Mr. Slack*).

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*Sir ALBERT ROLLIT said he hoped the Government would see their way to accept this proposal. The Amendment was not designed to give solicitors a right of audience at quarter sessions, that matter rested entirely with quarter sessions themselves, and in certain cases the right was given. The right of audience was almost universally given to solicitors before the present licensing committees, but as that committee was to be abolished and its place taken by a delegated committee of quarter sessions a question might arise as to whether solicitors would have right of audience before it. It was desirable that the question should be determined not only in the professional interest but also in the interest of the public, because many cases which would come before the new committee would not bear the expense of appearance by counsel, and in such cases unless the parties were able to do justice to themselves they would really have no representation at all.

Mr. H. D. GREENE (Shrewsbury) hoped the Amendment would not be accepted. For centuries past it had been the duty of quarter sessions to regulate the right of audience, and they had established the practice all over the country that where a sufficient representation of barristers could not be found they would hear solicitors. But it ought to be left to the quarter sessions to decide to whom they would give audience. There was no jealousy on the part of the Bar in the matter. The Bar was not so numerous a body as the solicitors; it was more under effective control; barristers had adopted certain sessions throughout the country, and it was easier for quarter sessions to recognise those who were continually appearing before them than solicitors who might come from all parts of the country, and who as strangers might not altogether command the confidence of the Court. The matter was an important one as it involved the giving to solicitors of a statutory right to appear. No such right was given in regard to the standing committees created in 1872, and he failed to see why such a right should be conferred by statute in connection with the new committee to be set up by this Bill. No public interest would be served by the Amendment, and he hoped it would be rejected.

MR. J. A. PEASE (Essex, Saffron Walden) said that inasmuch as solicitors were allowed to appear at the ordinary brewster sessions he could not understand why persons interested should not be permitted to be represented by solicitors before the committee of quarter sessions.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) was altogether opposed to the giving of any new statutory rights to solicitors. The last statutory right given to that profession involved an expenditure of £2,000 per annum from the public funds to enable solicitors to strike one another off the Rolls, but the duty had not been adequately performed, there being many solicitors who ought to have been so dealt with, but had not been. If a statutory right was to be given it should be reserved to barristers, though, personally, he would rather have neither barristers nor solicitors. In cases of the sort to be dealt with under this clause, an ordinary citizen could adequately represent his case before a body of intelligent country justices. He did not agree that the ordinary layman would be unable to do justice to his case. He would readily back an ordinary intelligent publican against an ordinary intelligent solicitor in such a matter. But the Court of quarter sessions would have power to hear either counsel or solicitors, and the choice ought to be left to the Court.

*SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.) reminded the Committee that barristers could not be briefed except through solicitors. The heavy cost of litigation in this country was caused by the necessity imposed upon suitors of having two legal advisers belonging to the different branches of the profession.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said the remedy was to abolish the solicitor.

*SIR HENRY FOWLER said if the hon. Member would propose it perhaps there would be no objection raised by the other branch of the profession.

SIR EDWARD CARSON: Would you give them compensation ?

*SIR HENRY FOWLER said that what were practically the duties of brewster sessions were to be transferred to a new body and all that was asked for by the mover of this Amendment, who represented the Law Society, was that solicitors should have the same right of audience before the standing committee as they had before the other body.

SIR EDWARD CARSON said this Amendment raised questions of importance not connected with this Bill at all, and the Licensing Bill was hardly the measure upon which they could settle them. This Bill did not alter the position of barristers or solicitors in their relation to quarter sessions, and proposed to leave it exactly as it was before. The hon. and learned Member for Islington said that solicitors had already the right to appear before brewster sessions and the licensing committee. That right was not going to be affected by this Bill. As regarded the licensing committee of quarter sessions, it had always rested with quarter sessions as to whether they would hear either barristers or solicitors or whether they would allow a solicitor to appear without a barrister. They were not going to interfere with that arrangement and were leaving that power with the quarter sessions, and it would remain exactly the same after this Bill had passed as it was before. To make a change, giving audience where the quarter sessions had before had the right to refuse audience, raised a question which he did not think ought to be settled in this way, because it raised much larger questions of principle..

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said this question did not matter to the solicitor at all, and it was not a question of wrangling between him and the barrister as to who should get the fees. The solicitor made a much better thing out of it when he instructed counsel than when he appeared himself. All they did by compelling them to select a barrister was to double the cost to the public. The Solicitor-General was a living example of what solicitors suffered from and the Attorney-General was another. The result of this system was that the barrister got all the fees and the solicitors got nothing but the work. This was not fair trade and he wanted a little reform in this respect. This was the only country in the world where they had a system of this sort. They certainly ought to abolish either the solicitor or the barrister. There were one or two other professions he should like to see abolished, and they might include the parsons, but that was rather wide of the subject. He wished to allow the client to choose for himself. In most districts the solicitors had a much wider experience in advocacy than barristers on this question, and why should they be prevented from presenting the same case before quarter sessions? It would save expense, and in many cases it would be more efficiently done. This would not be in the interests of solicitors because they would get smaller fees, but it would be in the interests of the public.

*MR. THEODORE TAYLOR said he did not advocate this proposal so much in the interests of solicitors as of the public. It would be presumptuous of him as a mere layman to express any opinion as between the respective branches of the legal profession, but he wished to retain the right of a client to have a solicitor to do the work he had done so long before the local bench. The Solicitor-General had stated that this Amendment was opening up by a side issue a great question, and he said he objected to take up such a large subject upon so small a point. The fact of the matter was they only wanted that the same business should be allowed to go into the hands of solicitors as had been given to them before. It was the Government who were making a little change in the procedure in this particular business, and they simply wished a client to continue to be able to have a solicitor instead of a barrister if he wished it. They did not wish generally to infringe the great professional principle which was at stake, and as a layman he was not going to express any opinion as to whether a solicitor or a barrister would be the better to employ. This Amendment was in the interests of the public, and he claimed for the public the same option, which they had had hitherto, to engage for this particular business those whom they had engaged before. Surely they could do this without raising the great issue which had been referred to by the Solicitor-General.

*MR. SLACK said he had not raised this question in the interests of the legal profession but solely in the interests of the general public. It seemed to him that the licensing law was in about as complicated a tangle as any branch of the law, and he thought that anyone interested in objecting to or in the renewal or refusal of a licence ought to have the opportunity of employing someone conversant with the law to appear on his or their behalf before the committee of quarter sessions. The section as framed did not give a right of audience to any person whatever, and the committee of quarter sessions might possibly hold that they had no power to hear anyone unless some such words as he had proposed were placed after the word "Act." Furthermore, an aggrieved licence-holder or a body of persons anxious to object to the renewal of a licence ought to have the right to retain the services of an advocate without being, in all cases, put to the additional expense which the retaining of a barrister as well as a solicitor would involve.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 161; Noes, 258. (Division List No. 229.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Asher, Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire

Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Delany, William
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice,CaptEC(S.Andrw's Bghs
Emmott, Alfred
Evans,SirFrancisH.(Maidstone
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J.M.F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E.(Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.

Harcourt,Lewis V. (Rossendale
Harwood, George
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones,David Brynmor(Sw'nsea
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy,Vincent P.(Cavan,W.
Kitson, Sir James
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,SirJoseph F.(Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murhpy, John
Newnes, Sir George
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary Mid
O'Down, John
O'Malley, William
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald

Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spear, John Ward
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas,Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas,David Alfred(Merthyr
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton,JohnLawson(Leeds,S.)
Walton, Joseph (Bansley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh,N.)
Woodhouse,Sir J T(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Slack and Sir Albert Rollit.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allhusen,Augustus HenryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hn.Sir H.
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. JoscelineFitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour,Rt HnGerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch
Banbury, Sir Frederick George

Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beach,Rt.Hn.Sir MichaelHicks
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, T. Gibson (King'sLynn
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell,Rt.Hn.J.A. (Glasgow
Campbell,J.H.M.(Dublin Univ.

Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A.(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavious Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Colomb, Rt. Hn. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Craig,Charles Curtis (Antrim,S.
Cripps, Charles Alfred

Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants. W.)
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Jochim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E. W. (B'rySEdm'ds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords. N.
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.)
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Rt Hn H. (Somers't, E
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Merbert Merton
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks N. R
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lutas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh, W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E (Wigt'n
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriesshire
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Morgan, David J. (Walthamst'w
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir Harry S. (Limehouse
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H. (Renfrew)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H. (Sheffield
Walker, Col. William Hall
Wallace, Robert
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Young, Samuel
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes

MR. DISRAELI (Cheshire, Altrincham) moved an Amendment to omit the words which would have the effect of abolishing the old licensing committee. He said he had no hostile intention in moving this Amendment. His object was to obtain from those responsible for the measure the reasons why the old county licensing committee had been abolished. That committee was an integral part of a public body, and it had rights and duties which worked into this Bill in a most satisfactory manner. He could not understand why the committee was to be done away with at the moment when another committee was to be appointed. He was conservative enough not to see an old body like the county licensing committee abolished without dropping a tear. He thought that it might have been utilised in working this Act instead of constituting an entirely new body.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 32, to leave out from the word 'and' to the end of Sub-section (2)."—(*Mr. Disraeli.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

Sir EDWARD CARSON said that the new committee would be the licensing committee of the quarter sessions, appointed by the same persons as the old committee was, but with certain restrictions as to the numbers.

Mr. DISRAELI withdrew his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 33, at end, to add the words '(3) The justices of a licensing district being a county borough shall exercise their powers under the Licensing Acts, 1828 to 1902, as to the renewal of licences through the borough licensing committee appointed under Section 38 of The Licensing Act, 1872, but such number as the whole body of justices acting in and for the borough determine shall be substituted for seven as the maximum number of that committee.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*Sir JAMES WOODHOUSE said he wished to move an Amendment to the Home Secretary's Amendment providing that such "greater" number of the licensing borough committee should be substituted for seven as the maximum number of the committee. The Amendment of the Government, whilst enabling the justices to increase the number of the committee, would also enable them to diminish it, and to appoint a committee of five instead of seven. He was anxious to make it clear that the intention of the Government was to make the number in excess of seven.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 4, after the word 'such' to insert the word 'greater.'"—(*Sir James Woodhouse.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'greater' be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

*Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS said that the justices would themselves decide what the number of the committee should be; but perhaps the hon. Member's idea was to make a minimum of seven, with power to increase the maximum. He would consider that point before Report.

*Sir JAMES WOODHOUSE said that on the understanding that the minimum would be seven, with power to increase the maximum, he would withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment to the proposed Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*Sir JAMES WOODHOUSE said that his next Amendment provided that the whole body of justices should be "qualified."

Amendment proposed—

"In line 4, after the second word 'of' to insert the word 'qualified.'"—(*Sir James Woodhouse.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'qualified' be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

Sir EDWARD CARSON said it had already been decided that men who were not qualified could not vote for the appointment of a committee. The Amendment of the Home Secretary had to be read in connection with previous Licensing Acts, and by inserting the word here it would throw doubts on the provisions of the other Acts where the same provision did not exist.

SIR ROBERT REID said he could not help thinking that this was a very important committee, and that it would be more prudent to make provision in the Act, so as to prevent any doubt or misgiving, that those who were on the committee were subject to some disqualification.

SIR EDWARD CARSON said he really did not think any difficulty would arise in ascertaining what was disqualification.

MR. WHITTAKER said he was glad to hear that disqualification did apply, and he hoped that the right hon. and learned Gentleman would be prepared to put words in to make it clear that the disqualification applied to the whole Bill.

MR. WHITLEY said he would make a special appeal to the Solicitor-General that the disqualification should be re-enacted in this Bill. He had had considerable experience of licensing committees, and he knew that it was exceedingly inconvenient to refer to several statutes in order to arrive at a point. It should be remembered that justices who were not qualified did take part in proceedings "at their own risk," and it was invidious for a private individual to challenge the vote of such justices. The real position could be understood better if some provision as to disqualification were put into this Bill, so as to prevent a continued reference to previous Acts.

SIR EDWARD CARSON said he must point out that this Act must be construed as one of the Licensing Acts from 1828 to 1902. It might be said why re-enact one section and not another. However, he would be willing to insert words to make the point clear.

*SIR JAMES WOODHOUSE said that as the reply of the Solicitor-General was sympathetic, he would ask leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment to the proposed Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.) said that as regarded the first part of his Amendment there was now no necessity to move it because of the assurance of the Solicitor-General. A new situation would be created by the Act, and justices would have a different type of cases to decide. Financial considerations would enter into questions, as they had not entered before, in connection with the payment of compensation, and it was essential that the actions of justices should be above suspicion. On that broad ground he would move his Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 33, at end, to add the words, 'No justice disqualified under the Licensing Acts, and no owner, lessee, or occupier of any licensed premises within any county, and no agent of such person acting, or who during the two years preceding shall have acted for him in any wise in connection with such licensed premises shall be qualified to act as a justice within such county for any of the purposes of this Act.'"—(*Mr. Herbert Roberts.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR EDWARD CARSON said that the Government could not possibly accept the Amendment. It would include in disqualification holders of shares in brewery companies, which was going a long way to find a personal interest. It would also debar any person who in anywise had acted as agent for and owner within two years, and that was going an enormous length. Surely the present law was stringent enough. The hon. Member suggested that a licence-holder in "any county" should be disqualified.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS said he meant "the" county.

SIR EDWARD CARSON said that even with that limitation he thought the present law was stringent enough.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. CRIPPS (Lancashire, Stretford) said at present, when there was an appeal to quarter sessions, the licensing magistrates, who dealt with the matter in the first instance, did not take part in a decision when the matter was under appeal. That was in accordance with a general principle of law, and should be followed in the altered procedure under the Bill to ensure an impartial tribunal. He used the words "decision of the committee," because in the view of those cognisant with quarter sessions procedure the presence of the justices might be useful to assist the tribunal.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 33, at end, to add the words—'(3) No justice who has taken part in any decision of quarter sessions shall, if on the committee, take part in any decision of the committee when the grant or renewal of such licence is under consideration.'"—(*Mr. Cripps.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir EDWARD CARSON said from a practical point of view it would be impossible to accept this Amendment. Reports would be received from all the licensing districts in the county, and, as, each part of the county would have to be considered in relation to the whole, the Amendment would mean that every man would have to be taken off when the report had to be decided upon.

Mr. CRIPPS said after what his right hon. and learned friend had said he would not press the Amendment. He would merely like to say that what the Solicitor-General suggested would not arise. The law as it now existed did not allow a magistrate to sit in appeal on a case, which he had already decided, when it came to quarter sessions. He hoped that practice would be followed in the future as it had been in the past in order to ensure the maximum of impartiality.

Mr. ELLIS GRIFFITH (Anglesey) said he did not know whether the Solicitor-General would see his way to accept the Amendment he now proposed to move on behalf of his hon. friend the Member for Carnarvon Boroughs to put in the words "or a non-county borough having a separate commission of the peace." But a moment's considation would show that a non-county borough having a separate commission of the peace ought to be represented at quarter sessions in some way or other. It was quite clear that this Amendment was directed to a defect in the Bill and offered a remedy for it if such a remedy was possible.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 29, after the words last inserted, to insert the words 'or a non-county borough having a separate commission of the peace."—(*Mr. Ellis Griffith.*)

Sir EDWARD CARSON said that when the question was first raised he had promised to put down an Amendment for the Report stage of the Bill. That promise he adhered to, but he could not say what the nature of his Amendment would be until he looked into the matter.

Sir EDWARD GREY admitted that the Solicitor-General had met them very fairly. He had promised to consider the matter between this and the Report stage, but he stated that he reserved his opinion now because of the difficulties of detail. The right hon. and learned Gentleman must not be surprised, however, if the Committee were a little disappointed in this matter, because it was quite possible that on the Report stage they might not have an opportunity of considering how far the right hon. Gentleman's Amendment fell short of their hopes. In view of the conditions under which the Report stage would be conducted it was necessary that hon. Members should express their views on the present occasion, in order that the Solicitor-General, who was anxious to meet them as far as possible, might be perfectly informed as to what the desires of the Committee were.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said he was particularly anxious that all these boroughs should be represented. There were so few of them that it would not be a serious matter to give each a representative. The Solicitor-General had agreed to insert words giving a statutory right of representation; would he not go a step further and say that such a right would be given to each of these boroughs?

Sir EDWARD CARSON said he could not go further than he had already intimated.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Question, "That Clause 5, as amended, stand part of the Bill," put, and agreed to.

Clause 6:—

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE, in moving to make the power of the Secretary of State to make rules "subject to the consent of Parliament," said that on the present occasion it was impossible to do more than discuss the general character of the regulations. The practice of devolving upon Government Departments important branches of legislation had made considerable progress under the present Government, and it was time the matter was seriously considered. The practice was, no doubt, largely due to Parliamentary exigencies. Governments had come to the conclusion that it was impossible to carry measures if Parliament was to be allowed to discuss, even within moderate limits, the proposals put forward; hence resort was had to all kinds of devices to withdraw from the cognisance of Parliament large portions of legislative proposals. The functions which under this clause were to be devolved upon the Home Secretary were such that Parliament fifteen years ago would not have dreamt of delegating to a Government Department. They practically comprised a Bill in themselves, and he desired to enter a general protest against this extension of the doctrine of legislation by Departments. Possibly it would be better that a Committee of the House should be appointed to draw up the regulations in conjunction with the Department; at any rate the House ought to retain some control over purely legislative matters of this character. He understood that the rules were not even to be laid upon the Table of the House. That was an entirely new departure. The requirement did not afford a very great safeguard, because an opportunity was very seldom given for the discussion of rules so laid, but the mere knowledge that Parliament had the power and might if necessary insist upon exercising it, was, at any rate, some safeguard against this kind of legislation. Parliament had tried devolution upon Grand and Select Committees, it was now trying devolution upon Government Departments, which was the worst of all possible kinds of devolution. The time had come when the House of Commons ought seriously to consider whether a stop should not be put to this encroachment upon its rights. The guillotine was bad enough, but this proposal was worse, and he submitted that some provision ought to be inserted reserving to the House of Commons the right to express its judgment upon the rules made under the clause. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 34, after the word 'may,' to insert the words 'subject to the consent of Parliament.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd George.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.) said that this clause was a good specimen of a species of draftsmanship which was becoming increasingly common, the object of which was to exclude from the consideration of the House matters which in old days were always recorded in the body of the Act itself or in the schedules. In the Municipal Corporations Act, for example, they would find the very same class of matters dealt with in the schedules, the details of which were subject to the criticism and received the approval of the House; and it was in order that the time of Parliament, or, what was more important, he supposed, that the time of the Government might be saved that this particular method of draftsmanship was employed. But it had never been carried quite to the same extent to which it had been carried in this clause. He was not going to discuss in detail the different sub-heads, but he wished to allude to the first sub-head, which provided that—

"A Secretary of State may make rules for carrying into effect this Act, and may by those rules, amongst other things—(a) provide for the provisional renewal of licences which are included in reports of the justices of a licensing district under this Act, and for consultation with those justices as to their reports, and the time and manner of the consideration of those reports, and of the payment of compensation."

That was a pretty large jurisdiction for a Minister of the Crown. The other sub-heads were—

"(b) provide for the enforcement of any security given for money borrowed, and for the time within which money borrowed is to be replaced; and (c) regulate the management and application of the compensation fund and the audit of the accounts of quarter sessions; and (d) provide for the mode of appointment, number, quorum, and procedure of committees, and for the employment of officers for the purposes of this Act; and (*e*) regulate the procedure for obtaining the consent of quarter sessions to the grant of a new on-licence, and for the hearing under this Act of persons interested in licensed premises; and (*f*) provide for the authentication of any documents on behalf of quarter sessions or their committees."

The whole of this new machinery would be subjected to the control of the Home Secretary, and Parliament was to have no control at all in the matter. He quite agreed that in Home Office administration it was necessary to give the Minister the power of framing special rules and regulations, but they had always required such special rules and regulations to be laid on the Table in order that they might receive the approval or disapproval of the House. There was no such provision in this clause and he would like to ask the Solicitor-General on what occasion and under what conditions the House of Commons would have the opportunity of bringing the Minister to book. If the House was not to have an opportunity by the laying of the rules and regulations on the Table he could not see any other way by which any rules and regulations which might be made could be brought under the control of the House. It was quite conceivable that some day or other they might have a Liberal Secretary of State in power, and he would have the framing of these regulations, and very drastic he might make them. Therefore, he was not making this appeal in any sense from the point of view of one Party or the other. He contended that in the interests of the authority and jurisdiction of the House of Commons they ought not to part lightly with so large a share in the framing of regulations which were essential to the proper carrying out of this Bill.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES said he took even a more serious view of the clause than did either the hon. Gentleman who moved the Amendment or the right hon. Gentleman who had just spoken. They seemed to think that it would be sufficient if the regulations were laid on the Table.

Mr. ASQUITH: We think that would be a safeguard.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES thought it would be no safeguard at all. Rules and regulations of the kind were laid on the Table, and unless an address was moved within forty days they had *ipso facto* the force of law. However much a private Member might desire to call them in question, he had no chance whatever of doing so except in the middle of the night, and practically no attention was called to them, for the simple reason that there was no opportunity during those forty days. Therefore what the right hon. Gentleman opposite thought might be a safeguard was no safeguard at all under the present rules of the House. Therefore he hoped that the right hon. Gentleman and his friends would dismiss from their minds the idea that this Amendment would meet the case.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) said the rules would have to receive the approval or disapproval of Parliament in the event of the Amendment being carried. The proceedings on the rules would be regarded as business exempted from the Standing Order by which business was interrupted at twelve o'clock.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES said he did not agree with the hon. Gentleman if he meant that the rules could be brought before the House for discussion after midnight. He did not believe the Speaker would hold that this was exempted business. He came now to the merits of the case. He agreed that it was a most serious thing to place this power in the hands of a Secretary of State. Consider what was to be done by the Bill. They had spent many days profitably, and some unprofitably, in limiting the powers of the licensing justices and quarter sessions. What they should and what they should not do had been argued, but Clause 6 upset the whole of the arrangements, and put the whole of the procedure of the justices, how they were to get money, and what they were to do with it, entirely under the Home Office. That was a supersession of the whole of the rest of the Bill. He did not know whether the right hon. Gentleman had read some of the clauses. He would only refer to sub-sections (b) and (c).

The Home Office was to make regulations to—

> "(b) provide for the enforcement of any security given for money borrowed, and for the time within which money borrowed is to be replaced; and
>
> "(c) regulate the management and application of the compensation fund and the audit of the accounts of quarter sessions."

Why, the whole of the rest of this Bill dealt with the method in which the compensation fund was to be raised and how it was to be applied, and now it was proposed by Clause 6 to take away all the power they had previously given and to hand it over at one fell swoop to the Home Office. He agreed that that was taking away the liberties of the House, and the liberties of the people of England. It was taking away power from the cognisance of the House and putting it into Provisional Orders, or orders by the Home Office, or other Departments, with respect to matters affecting the well-being of the subject. It was for the House to settle the terms of an Act of Parliament, to determine what the conditions were to be, and how the powers should be exercised. He submitted that the House had no right to delegate that power. The House had no right to say, "We are tired of debating the Bill; we cannot go into all the details required in order to insure that it shall be properly carried out, and we will hand the whole thing over to the Secretary of State for the Home Department." Secretaries of State were not always so perfect as the right hon. Gentleman who now represented the Home Office. They might have in that office the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife, and, although his own side would feel great confidence in him, he was not sure that Members on that side would feel equal confidence in him in the administration of the Licensing Acts. That was sufficient to show the extreme danger of allowing anything to pass from the power of the House. What was here proposed amounted not to delegation, but to usurpation, of the duties of the House. If the House agreed to a clause like this it would amount to a dereliction of their duty. This supersession of the House by Ministers in the making of rules had gone far enough, and it seemed to him that unless the House now made a stand the practice would go very much further than was safe for the House or the country. Let the House remember that he was a friend of this Bill. He thought it was a good Bill, and he had supported the Government upon it all through. But with regard to this clause he did entreat them to pause and think what they were doing. He could see no reason why this clause should not be omitted altogether, and quarter sessions and the licensing justices left to make the regulations required. Surely they could be trusted for that. He had been struck during the discussion of the Bill by the extreme ability, good temper, and accessibility to argument of the Solicitor-General. The hon. and learned Gentleman had shown a most remarkable instance of the ease with which a Minister who was accessible to reason might conduct a Bill through the House. His argument regarding this clause was not founded on prejudice against the Bill, the brewer, or the publican. It was based on the interests of the House of Commons, in which he was sure both the Solicitor-General and the Prime Minister felt as much interest as he did himself. He did not know whether the whole scope and final effect of this clause had been duly considered yet. It would take a great load off his mind if it could be withdrawn.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.) said he was afraid his hon. friend the Member for King's Lynn would think that his intervention in the debate showed that a less reasonable spirit was going to prevail than he found in the utterances of his hon. and learned friend the Solicitor-General. His hon. friend was alarmed at the terrible prospect of leaving matters of such immense importance to be dealt with, not by the House, but by an executive officer, the Home Secretary. But his own proposal was to leave them, not to the Home Secretary, who was responsible to the House, but to persons who did not owe any responsibility to the House. If these matters were legislative concerns which the House ought never to allow out of its grasp, what was to be thought of a proposal to turn every bench of quarter sessions in the country into a legislative assembly? Whatever might be their merits, the various parts of his hon. friend's speech did not hang together and form a single argumentative whole. He entirely dissented both from his hon. friend and from the right hon. Gentleman opposite as to the importance of the matters dealt with in this clause. He did not think they were of such importance as they supposed. They were matters purely of machinery, and he did not think it would be to the advantage of the House unnecessarily to cumber legislation with them. If there was anything which must have been brought home to every Member of the House, he would not say in the course of the present session, or of the last decade, but of the last twenty years, it was that the difficulty of getting a Bill through the House in the face of discussion, which might be of the most legitimate kind, was augmenting. It had produced some expedients to which he had himself given the sanction of his own example, but which he admitted were not of a kind to conduce to lucidity in legislation—for instance, legislation by reference. That method had been resorted to by both Parties. It was not that any Government desired to keep from the House matters which the House ought to discuss, but that any expedient by which the discussion of a Bill in the House could be shortened the Government of the day were almost bound to grasp at. Unless they did so it was really hardly possible to get through the modicum of legislation which was admitted on both sides to be necessary.

In his opinion the expedient adopted in Clause 6 was far less open to objection than the extreme cases of legislation by reference which themselves he regarded as necessary. Of course, it was possible to abuse the power of handing over to the Home Secretary or any other Minister, responsibilities which the House does not wish to take upon itself. But would anybody say that those powers were abused in the present case? The right hon. Gentleman had alluded to the Factory Acts, and said with perfect truth that it was necessary in these cases in order to secure elasticity that the Home Secretary should have great power of varying provisions with regard to different trades and districts. This power was of incomparably greater importance than anything in this purely machinery clause. With regard to the question of precedents, he reminded the Committee that by Clause 41 of the Licensing (Scotland) Act, passed by general consent last year, it rested in the first place with the licensing court—[Mr. McCRAE: Which is partly representative]—and then with the Secretary for Scotland, to deal with matters which were more than mere matters of machinery. He did not, however, care to rest this question on precedents, though precedents might be quoted. In a matter of machinery he thought it would be lunacy to insist that the whole machinery should be set out to be discussed and made an instrument of obstruction or a cause of long delay. Moreover, there was an inherent advantage in leaving these questions of machinery to an executive officer responsible to the House, because changes might occur, and the conditions in one district might differ from those in another. It would, of course, be possible to discuss the conduct of the executive officer in Committee of Supply.

MR. ROSE (Cambridgeshire, Newmarket) apologised for not having been in his place when his Amendment came on. The Prime Minister had said that this was purely a question of machinery, but having had considerable experience, he could say that machinery was frequently of vital importance. He firmly believed that if Parliament had the power of considering and drawing up carefully the regulations under which this measure would be worked, then it might be a step forward in temperance reform; but if the regulations were narrow and restricted, no decided progress would be made in temperance reform. Parliament should certainly have something to say in the drawing up of the regulations which would be the driving power of the machinery of the Act.

SIR JAMES JOICEY (Durham, Chester-le-Street) said that it was perfectly clear that the Bill as it stood proposed to take away very important powers from the control of the House, and he confessed he looked upon this with considerable alarm, because he felt sure that the system would be developed in other Bills and that practically the power which now rested with the House would be taken away and given to Government Departments. He had had a good deal to do with Government Departments, and he had come to the conclusion that all the wisdom did not rest with them. If the Bill were passed as it stood, most important matters would be left in the hands of the Home Secretary.

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

LICENSING BILL [4th Allotted Day].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. Lowther (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 6:—

Amendment again proposed—

"In page 3, line 34, after the word 'may' to insert the words 'subject to the consent of Parliament.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question proposed "That those words be there inserted."

Sir JAMES JOICEY, continuing his speech, said he simply rose to make a protest against the proposal to hand over these great powers to the Home Office. He had always been strongly in favour of the control of Parliament, but it had become the fashion to destroy the control of Parliament and place the control in the hands of the Government Departments. It was a somewhat extraordinary fact that, very often when the Prime Minister intervened, he did so just when some concession was going to be made in respect of some reasonable Amendment; and he therefore regretted that he had intervened on this occasion. Proceeding to argue in favour of the Amendment, Sir James pointed to the Scotch Act under which the licensing authority had to make the rules, which had to be confirmed by the Scotch Secretary. He thought it would be better if such a method were adopted in this Bill, for the licensing authorities were the proper persons to make the rules, but for some reason the Prime Minister was always more reasonable when dealing with Scotch legislations. If they looked at the regulations, he thought hon. Members would agree that the Bill took away from the licensing authorities a great deal of the power they ought to possess. The Home Office would practically become the licensing authority. In the Mines Regulations Act, to which the Prime Minister had referred, there was some protection to those who were affected by the rules; but in this Bill there was no such protection. This was a new departure altogether. He had the strongest objection to any such power being put in the hands of a Department, and he therefore felt it his duty to protest. He hoped the protest would have some effect and that the Solicitor-General would be able to make some concession.

Mr. RENWICK (Newcastle-on-Tyne) said he had the greatest possible objection to the Amendment. If it were carried the whole of this clause would be continuously being raised in the House. When they considered the congested state of business, that was not a state of things which anyone could look forward to with equanimity. The hon. Member for Chester-le-Street had told them the licensing committee was to be tabooed, but if this Amendment were carried it could not be anything else. He wished to see the greatest liberty possible given to licensing justices, and that seemed to be the wish of Members on both sides. He asked the House to consider what the Amendment really meant to which they were asked to consent. It meant that no rules could be made without the consent of Parliament and that every rule made would have to come before them. He did not believe the hon. Member opposite who moved the Amendment, but was not then in his place, could have given any consideration to it or he would have seen the absurdity of his suggestion. He was anxious if they were going to carry the Bill—as they were—to give the fullest power to the licensing authority, and, if hon. Members opposite were sincere in their desire to do the same thing, he might point out they would be defeating their desire by carrying the Amendment.

Mr. BROADHURST (Leicester) said that the object of this clause was to destroy all sense of independence and throw contempt upon all the local authorities. The Bill did not trust them even to decide what should be a quorum. Could anything be more absurd than that? The Committee of the House seemed to forget that there were on quarter session benches men who were as capable of administering, and as well able to decide what was just and what unjust, as most of the Members of that Committee. What could be more wanting in consideration and respect for these authorities than that the Home Office in London should make regulations, look after the application of the compensation fund, and audit the accounts of the quarter sessions? Quarter session accounts were audited now without any assistance, guidance, or help from the Home Office. Surely quarter sessions were perfectly capable of regulating the procedure of their own committees. He was amazed to find a great Department of State like the Home Office passing judgment and condemnation upon the common sense and administrative capacity of quarter sessions. The whole thing was a succession of insults to these old institutions.

Sir FREDERICK BANBURY (Camberwell, Peckham) on a point of order, asked if the hon. Member had read the Amendment. The Amendment was not to take away powers from the quarter sessions but to say that rules should be made by the Home Office, subject to the consent of Parliament.

Mr. BROADHURST said he would respectfully suggest that he was perfectly capable of understanding what he was talking about and was not in the least likely to be instructed or assisted by the hon. Member for Peckham. He agreed that while the Amendment would do something to retain the existing rights of ancient bodies it would have been better if it had proposed the omission of Clause 6 altogether. Nobody knew better than the Solicitor-General that the clause was unworthy of the great Department of State it concerned. It was drafted on the principle of "teaching one's grandmother to suck eggs." Brewster sessions and quarter sessions were quite as capable of dealing with the Licensing Acts as the Home Office, and if the mover of the Amendment went to a division he should certainly support him. It would at least secure some measure of protection to those bodies, since it ensured that the rules should not come into operation until they had lain on the Table of the House for at least forty days.

Mr. LLOYD WHARTON said he was entirely against the Amendment. He could not see why Parliament should be entrusted with the examination of the rules, for already its time was sufficiently taken up with other work. Up till 1888 quarter sessions had the whole of county finance to deal with. Since then the county councils had taken most of that work over. He believed that quarter sessions were still competent to deal with finance to some extent, and he suggested that certain matters in the sub-clauses should be referred to the quarter sessions, such as the borrowing of money, rules of procedure, etc. As chairman of quarter sessions he should be glad to be under the advice and sanction of the Home Office. Meanwhile he suggested that the chairmen of quarter sessions and the Home Office should meet, and having discussed the procedure to be evolved under the Act, draw up rules which would be satisfactory for the guidance of all.

Mr. GEORGE WHITE (Norfolk, N.W.) said that the object of the Amendment was somewhat misunderstood. The desire of those who supported it was that part of the rules might be left to quarter sessions, and the remainder submitted to Parliament instead of being entirely in the control of the Home Secretary. It was important to remember that the Bill had been passed through the House under very exceptional circumstances. The great powers proposed to be entrusted to the Home Secretary might be justified if the Bill had been thoroughly threshed out in Committee. Then it would have been for the House to determine what those powers should be which were to be delegated to the Home Secretary. But the Bill had been forced through the House without adequate opportunity for debate, and the House might well be jealous of the rights it conferred upon the Home Secretary. He could not agree with the Prime Minister that the rules were a mere matter of machinery. They raised many important questions of principle. By the first sub-section of the clause the Home Secretary had to keep the licence provisionally alive, pending an appeal against an adverse decision. That was a clear intimation that a licence was dead at the end of the year, and, but for the power placed in the hands of the Home Secretary, would actually expire—an argument for which the Opposition had been contending throughout. That power might, or might not, be wisely exercised by the Home Secretary, but it justified the contention of the Opposition. Some part of this sub-section was not very intelligible. It provided for the provisional renewal of licences which were included in the reports of the licensing justices, and for consultations with the justices as to their reports, and the time and manner of the consideration of those reports. Surely that did not take cognisance of the fact that brewster sessions was a Court of justice. He did not quite understand how the Home Secretary was to have consultations with the justices upon these reports. Someone must have an injustice done him by such an arrangement—either the licensee or the public — by *ex parte* statements made in consultation with the Home Secretary.

SIR EDWARD CARSON: The hon. Member is an error. The consultation is between the licensing justices and quarter sessions, and has nothing to do with the Home Secretary.

MR. GEORGE WHITE said the same argument applied. Those who had to arbitrate had no right to hear *ex parte* statements. He did not see any provisions made for the public to appear. There was very much more care taken of the interests of the trade than of the public. He asked the Government to reconsider the whole matter and allow a part of these duties to devolve upon quarter sessions, which could deal with them better than the Home Secretary, who could not know all the circumstances; and though there was a good deal to be said for placing some of these matters in the hands of the Home Secretary, others certainly ought to be subject to revision by Parliament.

*MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS said he did not think the Government had shown any desire to take from quarter sessions any further powers than they thought absolutely necessary. Before making these rules, his first effort would be to secure the co-operation of the experienced representatives of quarter sessions and to ask them to assist him, probably by serving on a committee with expert officials of the Home Office, in framing these rules. That was the ordinary way in which rules were framed under any Act passed through that House. It was on the ground of uniformity that he desired to retain the rule-making power in the hands of the Secretary of State. He could assure the Committee that it was with no desire to override quarter sessions or local opinion. He would endeavour to get all the assistance possible from those who had been accustomed to carry out the duties of quarter sessions and who in future would have to carry out the provisions of this Bill.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH said the complaint of the Opposition against this clause was that it introduced a vicious principle into the legislation of the country. He was surprised that the hon. Member for Leicester should stand up as the champion of quarter sessions; he had always known that that Assembly was the Mother of Parliaments, but he had not known before that quarter sessions were the grandmother of the Home Secretary —that being the only inference he could draw from his hon. friend's speech. The Home Secretary's explanation of the manner in which he would make these rules was not at all reassuring. The Bill under discussion was not an uncontroversial measure dealing with factories or the regulation of mines; it was a measure so controversial in its character and so political in its clauses that the Government had had to adopt exceptional methods to pass it into law. And yet the Home Secretary, who was not only a great executive officer but a man of keen political perception, was to frame the rules! The proposal showed a great lack of trust in quarter sessions. They were not to be trusted to settle even the quorum of the committee! He was not previously aware of the existence of the Association of Chairmen of Quarter Sessions, which the right hon. Gentleman proposed to consult, but it was certain to be a body of one political complexion, and in connection with the administration of a partisan measure such as that under discussion, it would be less capable than one would wish of that impartiality which was so desirable in a body by which the Home Secretary was to be advised. In Clause 6 Parliament was legislating not only by compartment but by Department. However valuable the Home Secretary might be as an executive officer, he was not the gentleman to legislate as provided for in this Bill. What was really meant by Sub-section (c)? Was it really intended that the Home Secretary, after consultation with the chairmen of quarter sessions, should regulate the application of the compensation fund? If so, the right hon. Gentleman would be able to override all the clauses of the Bill. Whatever the Home Secretary did ought to be subject to the control and authority of Parliament, and upon that ground he supported the Amendment.

Mr. H. C. RICHARDS (Finsbury, E.) urged the necessity of securing uniformity in the rules of quarter sessions. In each of the counties of London, Middlesex, Sussex, and Kent the rules with regard to licensing matters were different, and it was most difficult for persons called upon professionally to go from one county to another to know exactly how to comply with the different regulations. If it had been proposed that the Local Government Board or the Board of Trade should draw up these rules he would have voted with the Opposition, because in those Departments the permanent officials controlled everything; but at the Home Office it was quite different. The Home Secretary was surrounded by experienced gentlemen who were able to give the intelligent construction which was so much required in these matters. He somewhat favoured the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Ripon that the quarter sessions should meet and submit rules to the Home Office, but on the whole he thought the Home Secretary had made out his case for a meeting between himself and the representatives of quarter sessions for the purpose of arranging a set of rules. His main purpose in rising, however, was to express astonishment at the speech of the hon. Member for Leicester, who had made an heroic defence of quarter sessions. He had had the pleasure of reading the speeches of the hon. Member for some twenty-five years, and had followed his career with the greatest interest, and he noted that his defence of quarter sessions had only occurred since the hon. Member had been put on the commission of the peace for the county of Norfolk. ["Oh!"] He had a high opinion of quarter sessions when the removables were not on, but when he saw the way in which these gentlemen were brought up to support each other's local authority in cases where a local authority was trying to run down some unfortunate private individual, he had not that respect for quarter sessions that he used to have.

Mr. BROADHURST: Who are the removables?

Mr. H. C. RICHARDS said they were the gentlemen who sat for one year and upwards, the chairmen of urban and district councils, who as a rule were a disgrace to the bench. ["Oh!" and "Order."]

Mr. BROADHURST: On the point of order, Sir. I am not aware whether there is any Gentleman in this House who acts as justice of the peace in consequence of being chairman of a local authority—I am certainly not one—but at any rate I ask whether it is in order for an hon. Member of this House to charge justices of the peace with being a disgrace to the bench.

***The CHAIRMAN**: It is doubtful at any time whether it is a desirable thing for a Member of this House to make use of his position to violently attack private individuals. Personally I should very much like to see the rule considerably modified. But the rule does exist, and apparently a Member of this House may attack in any unmeasured terms anybody who is outside the House without any fear of the consequences. At the same time I think the hon. Member's reference to these gentlemen as being a disgrace to the Bench is rather a strong expression, and I hope he may see his way to modify it.

Mr. H. C. RICHARDS said any expression which fell from the Chair would have his sincere attempt at obedience. He would modify the letter of his observation, though the spirit would remain the same ["Order" and "Withdraw"]; they were not a disgrace to the bench, because the bench had been so altered now——

An HON. MEMBER: Withdraw generously.

Mr. H. C. RICHARDS said it was one thing when quarter sessions were represented by gentlemen like the hon. Member for Leicester or the hon. Member for King's Lynn, whose only idea, they knew, would be to administer justice, but quite a different thing when gentlemen of less experience acted on quarter sessions for a brief time. The Bill was to come into operation as soon as the Royal Assent had been given; it would therefore be absurd not to be able to bring the rules into operation until the meeting of Parliament or forty days after.

Mr. THOMAS SHAW (Hawick Burghs) expressed his high appreciation of the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Ripon, which he understood to be that quarter sessions should be allowed first to make substantial regulations as to detail and procedure, and that after that there should be, if necessary, the imprimatur of the Home Office. He was of opinion that the precedent of the Licensing (Scotland) Act, 1903, cited by the Prime Minister, was really in favour, not of the clause under discussion, but of the suggestion made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Ripon. The present clause read—

> "A Secretary of State may make rules . . ."

whereas in Section 49 of the Act cited the words were—

> "Without prejudice to their other powers under this Act. A licensing Court may from time to time make by-laws as they think fit."

and Sub-section (2) provided that—

> "A by-law made by a licensing Court under this section shall not come into operation until it has been confirmed by the Secretary for Scotland."

The precedent cited by the Prime Minister for the clause was no precedent at all. He did not think it should be in the power of the Secretary of State to make the rules regulating the application of the compensation fund. That was a matter of statecraft. The idea of a defence being offered for this clause on the ground that it was a necessity of our Parliamentary procedure was another instance of the desire of the Government to transfer duties which properly belonged to Parliament to the shoulders of State officials. In these important matters it was now proposed to divorce the control of Parliament and relegate to a set of State officials at Whitehall the regulation, management, and application of the compensation fund. That appeared to him to be a matter on which the consent of Parliament ought to be taken. Quarter sessions might vary in their circumstances, and they might wish to make different regulations in regard to their procedure, and why should they not do so, and afterwards apply for the consent of the Secretary of State? That system was working well in Scotland, and it would give local authorities more power of initiative and less power to the Secretary of State. While he had offered these remarks in no controversial spirit, he perfectly understood that the scheme of the Bill was to give more power, jurisdiction, and control to the quarter sessions of the country. He did not, however, expect to find any supporter of the Government using the liberty, which they all had, to attack the *personnel* of quarter sessions in the language they had just heard. Amid all the criticisms of the Bill he knew of none which suggested that having regard to the character or qualifications of the *personnel* of the bench they were doing wrong in vesting them with these additional powers.

Sir EDWARD CARSON said he had always deprecated attacks on the justices who had to administer the law, whether in this country or in Ireland. He was afraid it was a matter of complaint that parties in that House did attack those who had no power to answer for themselves. That was a matter in regard to which both sides ought to be equally jealous, and he was afraid complaint as to the practice could not come from one side more than from the other. The Amendment before the Committee was that the rules ought to be laid before Parliament, and the Prime Minister had quoted the Scotch precedent to show that equally important rules were withdrawn from the cognisance of Parliament. The debate was now turning on the question whether the rules ought to be made by quarter sessions or by the Home Secretary, a matter entirely inconsistent with the Amendment. The hon. Member for Leicester, who had had some experience at the Home Office, said that they might strike out Clause 6 altogether and that the Bill would work perfectly well with the rules quarter sessions would lay down. If that were true what became of the argument that there was legislation in Clause 6. It was simply a question of which was the best method of procedure. Several hon. Members who had spoken had apparently forgotten that, in the course of the afternoon, he had accepted an Amendment by which quarter sessions were to be allowed to regulate their own procedure in the one important matter dealt with in Clause 6 which most properly appertained to quarter sessions. There were, however, some matters in this clause which ought to be left in the hands of the Home Office, and he could not see his way to alter the clause in the way which the hon. Member for Ripon had suggested. The hon. Member stated that the question of the renewal of the licence was a very important one. He wished to point out that they had already enacted that quarter sessions alone could refuse the renewal of a licence. If there was legislation in the clause he should be as jealous as any Member of the House of relegating it to a Department. But the matters provided for by the clause were all matters of a purely administrative nature. The question of delegating legislative powers to the Home Office was not at all involved. It was of importance, for the smooth working of the Act, that there should be uniformity of administration throughout the country, and that uniformity would be secured by the formulation of rules by the Home Office, which, of course, would act in consultation with the representatives of quarter sessions.

Mr. BRYN ROBERTS (Carnarvonshire, Eifion) agreed that it was desirable to have uniformity; but the clause destroyed uniformity instead of achieving it, because it set aside the safeguard which Parliament had provided against abuses in the formulation of rules by a Department. This procedure was by no means new, and it had been almost constantly applied in this House. It had been of such constant application that not long ago an Act of Parliament had to be passed for the purpose of regulating it. He thought it was incumbent upon the Government to show that there was some special reason in this particular case why the method adopted should not be the usual method enacted by Parliament to be followed. Promises made across the floor of the House were very ephemeral, and were often forgotten. He protested against the abuse of legislation by rules where the Act of Parliament was set aside in favour of a loose statement made across the floor of the House. Up to the present when a final body of rules were fixed they were laid before Parliament, and when Parliament did not move an Address they automatically became law without any further trouble. Why was that procedure not to be followed in this case? There ought to be some explanation why it was not followed. The argument that this was a matter of machinery was beside the mark. On that side they acknowledged that there must be rules regarding details which could not be framed in the House and which must be delegated, but what they did not acknowledge was that the power of repudiation, provided for by the Rules Publication Act, should be absolutely taken away as it was by this proposal.

Mr. LLOYD WHARTON thanked the Home Secretary for conceding the suggestion he had made. He believed that a joint consultation between the Home Office and some members of quarter sessions would lead to the acceleration of a satisfactory settlement of this question. In that way they would get unanimity instead of each quarter sessions agreeing upon their own rules.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON said he interposed for the purpose of recommending to the attention of the Solicitor-General the compromise which had been suggested by his hon friend behind him. What his hon. friend proposed was that words should be introduced in the Bill requiring that the rules should be laid before Parliament. That would not in any way subject the rules to discussion in Parliament. It would not make them exempted business, and they could not come on for discussion after twelve o'clock, but it would bring the rules within the Rules Publication Act of 1893 which contained some valuable provisions. He asked the Solicitor-General whether he could not see his way to agree to this compromise and promise to introduce words so as to allow the rules to be laid before Parliament.

Sir EDWARD CARSON said he quite agreed as to the usefulness of the Rules Publication Act to which his hon. friend had referred. If there were any rules to be made under this Bill of the character and importance which required them to be laid before Parliament, he should at once accede to the request which had been made, but having thought over the matter, and knowing the importance of being able to revise the rules—because in the first instance they might be tentative—he really did suggest to the hon. and learned Member that there was nothing in the rules to make it necessary to go through the formality required by the Rules Act of 1893. The rules were intended merely to smooth the working of the Bill. They contained nothing to which any one could object.

***Mr. LAWSON WALTON** (Leeds, S.) said he wished to make one observation in relation to the proposed method of procedure under the Bill. The Solicitor-General, following the Prime Minister, said this was purely a matter of machinery. He was not aware of any kind of statutory construction by which they could distinguish between what was mere machinery and what was a substantive provision. What was proposed by the scheme now before the Committee was to cast upon some Department a burden which rested upon the House itself, namely, to regulate the method by which that law was to be administered. What was here proposed was entirely novel, and he supposed it was due to the over-burdening of the Parliamentary machine. He could not accept the statement of the Solicitor-General that these rules were mere machinery, that there would be nothing of a substantive character in them, that therefore it did not much matter who made the rules provided he was someone competent, and that it did not much matter when they were made.

Sir EDWARD CARSON: They should be made as quickly as possible.

***Mr. LAWSON WALTON** said they had had experience in connection with certain recent Acts of Parliament, that where the framing of rules was left to one of the Departments of the State, the duty was not carried out. In this case they were getting rid of a burden placed upon them, and shuffling it on to the shoulders of some Department, but they were not laying down any period in which the rules should be framed, and they were not providing for checking them officially after they had been constructed. In connection with more than one statute they had had the will of Parliament reduced to futility, owing to the fact that an obligation placed on a Department had not been discharged. The Solicitor-General had said that it was undesirable that these rules should be left to quarter sessions, because they would lack the uniformity which ought to characterise rules of universal application. That was the very test which showed that they did belong to the sphere of legislation. The moment it was necessary that the rules should be of universal application they found a condition of things to which legislation, and legislation alone, was applicable in order to impart the uniformity to the system which was desired. If there was to be uniformity, he submitted that they at once invoked legislative authority in order to impose on a reluctant, or indifferent, or objecting jurisdiction, the will of some central authority. Was that to be the Home Office or not?

There was this important consideration, that when previous Acts of Parliament had been under consideration the rules had been framed before the Bill was introduced. He should not be challenging this method of procedure if the rules had been framed, but this legislation was immature, it was crude, it had not been fully developed, because the Government left to a vague and indefinite future the framing of rules which were essential to give effect to this legislation. In many Acts of Parliament during the past few years, schedules had contained the rules so that Parliament could consider them contemporaneously with the measure which was to give effect to them and add to them the sanction of law. He presumed that his right hon. friend would tell them that the rules had never been discussed. Therefore this was a new departure in legislation. He defied his hon. and learned friend to distinguish between what was substantive and what was procedure. He remembered that the House spent many hours in considering matters of procedure in connection with the Workmen's Compensation Act. The Committee had spent hours in discussing the details of this measure, but the whole legislation was to be at the mercy of the Home Department, which might make rules which would defeat the views of the House. As a constitutional lawyer he protested against these rules being forced on quarter sessions by the Home Office. When it was considered that it was essential that rules should be uniform and general in their application, then they had a legislative character and should find a place in a schedule of the Act. The rules should be laid before Parliament and subjected to Parliamentary review. Experience had shown how the intention of an Act might be defeated by the procedure adopted in putting it in force.

Mr. BOUSFIELD (Hackney, N.) said the time had gone by when the House could afford to spend hours in discussing procedure under such a measure as this. The duty of framing rules ought to be carried out by the Departments. The practice was to frame draft rules, then to consult a large number of people interested in the subject and invite suggestions from them for their improvement. He had no doubt that in this case the draft rules would be submitted to the chairmen of quarter sessions and others, and the result would be that a practical set of rules would be drawn up. If they were to frame rules by legislation, there would be a loss of flexibility and adaptability, and many mistakes might be made which could only be rectified with much difficulty and expense.

*Mr. AINSWORTH (Argyllshire) said that before they divided as to the whole clause, he might be allowed to call the attention of the right hon. Gentleman the Solicitor-General to what he thought was a perfectly parallel case. Under the Education Act every educational authority was required to send up a scheme to the Education Department for approval. He would suggest that if the details were to be withdrawn from Parliament, every quarter sessions should be required to send up a licensing scheme to the Home Secretary, so that he might have every information before him, and be able to decide whether the scheme was one which would work in the circumstances of the locality.

Mr. DISRAELI said that in his very interesting speech the hon. Member for Hackney advocated the rules being framed, and carried out by the Department. They all knew that the hon. Member for Hackney got a Bill through the House which required considerable assistance from the Home Secretary, but no Judge or member of the legal profession would have anything to do with it. He must say that there was a good deal in what the hon. and learned Member for Leeds had stated in regard to this question. After the way the Home Office had behaved in regard to the last clause, he did not know that they were much to be trusted in carrying out these important regulations. He thought that such matters should be left to the decision either of this House or of quarter sessions. The rules were to provide for the provisional renewal of licences, and for the payment of compensation; to provide for the enforcement of any security for any borrowed money, and for its repayment; to regulate the management and application of the compensation fund, and the audit of accounts; to provide for the appointment of committees, the regulation of procedure in granting a new licence; and to provide for the authentication of documents. Now, these were matters which at the present moment were dealt with by the licensing authorities, and there was not one of those regulations which could not be framed by quarter sessions or petty sessions without the assistance of the Home Office. The Solicitor-General said that he wanted uniformity, and so the Home Office was to make rules and regulations; but on the previous day the Prime Minister said that he was in favour of variety, and for that reason petty sessions were to make their own rules and regulations. He did not understand that contradiction. He was very strongly of opinion that, whatever might be the merits of the Department in drawing up regulations, these rules and regulations under this Bill should be made either by the House or by quarter sessions.

Mr. BRYN ROBERTS moved to insert the words, "with the consent of Parliament." The simple effect of that Amendment would be that the machinery of the 1893 Act would be adopted. The Home Secretary would publish the rules provisionally, and after a certain number of days any local body might take objection to them. The Home Secretary would then, after considering the objections, publish them as final rules, which would be laid on the Table of the House and after a certain number of days they would become law, unless some Members objected. There was no objection to that method being adopted in this Bill. It would secure that the public would be heard, that quarter sessions would be heard, and that Parliament would have an opportunity of reviewing them.

*The CHAIRMAN said the proper course for the hon. Member to take would be to ask the hon. Member for Newmarket to withdraw his Amendment, and then to submit his own.

Mr. BRYN ROBERTS said he thought his Amendment would come after the rules; but he agreed to the Chairman's ruling.

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said he hoped the Solicitor-General would agree to some compromise on the point. Many hon. Members could not go the full length of the Amendment, but it was perfectly reasonable that there should be some method of publication before the rules became operative.

Sir EDWARD CARSON said that it was desirable that there should be no delay whatever in the preparation of the rules, and that there should be the greatest possible elasticity for revising the rules. He could not accept the Amendment.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 181; Noes, 263. (Division List No. 230.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Asher, Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, RtHonHerbertHenry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice,CaptEC(SAndrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T.(Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford

Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick
Griffiths, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hain, Edward
Harcourt, Lewis V(Rossendale
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. CharlesFredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kemp, Lieut.-Colonel George
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan,W
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Law, HughAlex. (Donegal,W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,SirJoseph F.(Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David

Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh,N
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien,Kendal (TipperaryMid
O'Dowd, John
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reid, SirR. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, Daivd James

Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, TheodoreC. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds,S
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Woodhouse, SirJT(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allhusen, AugustusHenryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. HonSirH
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, RtHon. A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, RtHn GeraldW(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beach, Rt.Hn.SirMichaelHicks
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Burke, E. Haviland
Butcher, John George
Campbell, J.H.M.(DublinUniv.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, RtHnJA (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Colomb, Rt. Hon. Sir JohnCR
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Craig, CharlesCurtis(Antrim,S.
Cross, Herb. Shepherd(Bolton
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles

Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir HoratioD(Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dewar, Sir T.R.(TowerHaml'ts
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. SirJosephC
Dixon-Hartland, SirFredDixon
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt. HonSir WilliamHart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Fergusson, Rt. Hn.SirJ(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir RobertPenrose
Fitzroy, HonEdward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S(WarwickSW.

Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn. J.E(Elgin&Nairn)
Gordon, MajEvans(T'rH'mlets
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, SirEW(B'rySEdmnd's
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F.Leverton(Tynem'th)
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords.N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford,W.)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard,John(Kent,Faversham
Hozier, Hon JamesHenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain HerbertMerton
Kennaway, RtHon SirJohn H.
Kenyon, Hon.Geo.T.(Denbigh)
Kerr, John
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F.(Liverpool)
Lawson, JohnGrant(Yorks.NR
Lee, ArthurH(Hants.,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Fredrick N.S.
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col.Charles W.(Evesham
Long, Rt. HnWalter(Bristol,S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb, Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M‘Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M‘Iver, SirLewis(Edinburgh,W
M‘Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
M‘Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W.F.
Maxwell, Rt.Hn.SirHE(Wigt'n
Maxwell,W.J.H(Dumfriesshire
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt HonSirFrederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon.J. Scott(Hants)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, DavidJ(Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray,RtHn.A.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nolan,Col.John P. (Galway,N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley,Hon.M.W. (Stalybridge
Ridley,S.Forde (Bethnal Green
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H(Hertford, East
Smith, James Parker(Lanarks)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D.(Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E(WBromwich)
Stanley, HonArthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas(Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M‘Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt.Hn. J.G (Oxf'd Univ
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col.Sir CEH(Sheffield
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel WilliamGeorge
Welby, Lt.-Col. ACE(Taunton
Welby, SirCharlesGE(Notts)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. JohnLloyd
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby, de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H.(Yorks.
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley,Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

And, it being after Eleven of the clock, the Chairman proceeded, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 5th July, successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments moved by the Government of which notice had been given, and on every Question necessary to dispose of the allotted Business to be concluded on the 4th allotted Day.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 8, after the word 'committees,' to insert the words 'of quarter sessions and for the constitution of those committees where requisite as standing committees, and also for the addition to those committees in the case of a county, of representatives of the justices of any boroughs within the county not being county boroughs, but having a separate commission of the peace.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 10, to leave out from the word 'procedure,' to the word 'and,' in line 13, and insert the words "of quarter sessions on the consideration of the reports of justices of a licensing district under this Act and on any hearing under this Act with reference to the refusal of the renewal of on-licences or the division of the amount to be paid as compensation.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Question put, "That the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided—Ayes, 267; Noes, 182. (Division List, No. 231.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allhusen, AugustusHenryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, RtHonSirH.
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. JoscelineFitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. HonAJ(Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, RtHnGeraldW(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir FrederickGeorge
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. AllenBenjamin
Beach, Rt.Hn.SirMichael Hicks
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, J.H.M.(Dublin Univ.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Colomb, Rt. Hon. Sir John CR
Colston, Chas. Edw. H.Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Craig, CharlesCurtis(Antrim,S.
Cross, Herb. Shepherd(Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, SirHoratioD.(Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dewar, Sir T R (Tower Hamlets
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon.Sir Joseph C
Dixon-Hartland,Sir FredDixon
Doogan, P. C.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir WilliamTheodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt Hon Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants,W)
Fergusson, Rt Hn Sir J.(Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. EdwardAlgernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S(Warwick,S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn J.E.(Elgin&Nairn)
Gordon, MajEvans-(T'rH'mlets
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Goschen, Hon. GeorgeJoachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, SirEW(B'rySEdm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hardy, Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords. N. W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, SirA(Stafford, W.)
Hermon-Hodge, SirRobert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham)
Hozier, Hon.JamesHenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. HonArthur Fred.
Jessel, CaptainHerbertMerton
Kennaway, Rt. HonSir John H
Kenyon, Hon GeoT.(Denbigh)
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant (YorksNR
Lee, ArthurH (Hants.,Fareh'm
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col.Charles W.(Evesham
Long, RtHnWalter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (EdinburghW
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn.W.F.
Maxwell, RtHnSirHE(Wigt'n)
Maxwell, W.J.H.(Dumfriesshir
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt.Hon.SirFrederickG.
Milvain, Thomas

Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon.J.Scott(Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan,DavidJ.(Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Alymer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, RtHnAGraham(Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan, ColJohnP(Galway,N)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Dowd, John
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pease, HerbertPike(Darlington
Peel, Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharpe
Pretyman, Ernest Geogre
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon.M.W.(Stalybridge
Ridley, S.Forde(BethnalGreen)
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Smith, JamesParker(Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E.(W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hon. Arthur(Ormskirk
Stanley, EdwardJas(Somerset)
Stanley, Rt.Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G(OxfordUniv
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, ColSirCEH(Sheffield)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E.(Taunton
Welby,Sir CharlesG.E.(Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H.(Ashton-und-Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York,E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W H (Yorks.)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Asher, Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dobbie, Joseph
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, CaptEC(SAndrw'sBghs.
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, SirFrancisH(Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt.Hon.SirE. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hain, Edward
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Horval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West
Horniman, Frederick, John
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kemp, Lieut.-Colonel George
Kennedy, Vincent P.(Cavan,W
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)

Layland-Barrall, Francis
Leese, SirJosephF(Accrington)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mitchell, Edw.(Fermanagh,N.)
Morgan, J.Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal (TipperaryMid
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reid, Sir R.Threshie(Dumfries)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Stevenson, Francis S.
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips.
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson(Leeds,S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Woodhouse,SirJ.T.(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

Clause 7:—

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 20, after the word 'substitution,' to insert the words 'for quarter sessions.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 21, to leave out the words 'for quarter sessions.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 21, to leave out from the word 'sessions,' to the end of line 24."—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment b made," put, and agreed to.

Question put, "That the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 267; Noes, 178. (Division List No. 232.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. HonSirH
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt.JoselineFitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour,Rt.Hon.A.J.(Manch'r.)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour,RtHnGeraldW.(Leeds)
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beach,Rt.Hn.Sir Michael Hicks
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell,J.H.M.(Dublin Univ.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, RtHnJA(Worc.)
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Colomb,Rt. Hon. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Craig,Charles Curtis (Antrim,S.
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, W. Bromley
Davies, SirHoratioD.(Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dewar, Sir T.R.(TowerHamlets
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon.SirJosephC
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph

Dixon-Hartland, SirFredDixon
Doogan, P. C.
Doughty, Sir Geogre
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt.Hon.SirWilliamHart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund, B. (Hants, W.)
Fergusson,Rt.Hn.Sir J.(Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hon.EdwardAlgernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S.(Warwick S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn)
Gordon, MajEvans-(T'rH'mlets
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry, Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,SirE.W.(B'rySEdm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hardy,Laurence (Kent,Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton(Tynem'th)
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, ArthurHoward(Hanley)
Heath, James(Staffords,N.W.).
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, SirA(Stafford, W.)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, John(Kent,Favershao
Hozier, Hon.JamesHenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kennaway, Rt.Hon.SirJohnH.
Kenyon, Hon.Geo.T.(Denbigh)
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson,JohnGrant(Yorks.N.R
Lee,Arthur H.(Hants.Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, FrederickN.S.
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.)
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas,Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, SirLewis(EdinburghW
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell,RtHn SirH.E.(Wigt'n
Maxwell, W. J.H.(Dumfriessh'r
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner,Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan,DavidJ.(Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt.HnAGraham(Bute
Murray,CharlesJ(Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate,Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan, Col.JohnP.(Galway,N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pease,HerbertPike (Darlington
Peel, Hn.Wm.RobertWellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon.M.W.(Stalybridge
Ridley, S.Forde(BethnalGreene
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel, Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith,Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, JamesParker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hon.Arthur(Ormskirk
Stanley, EdwardJas.(Somerset)
Stanley, Rt.Hon.Lord(Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Taylor. Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col.Edward
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col.SirCEH(Sheffield)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby,Lt.-Col.A.C.E.(Taunton
Welby,Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley,H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A.Stanley(York,E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, SirW.H.(Yorks.)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel
Younger, William

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Asher, Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry

Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. (Vaughan-(Cardigan
Delany, William
Dobbie, Joseph
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffiths, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hain, Edward
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fred.
Hutton-Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kemp, Lieut.-Col. George
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W.
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lawson, Sir. Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh, N.)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, C. (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, J. Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robson, William Snowdon
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Stevenson, Francis S.
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, T. C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, J. Lawson (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, G. (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Woodhouse, Sir J.T. (Hudd'd.
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

Clause 8.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 29, at the end, to insert the words, '(2) If the justices of a licensing district refuse to renew an on-licence on the ground that the holder of the licence has persistently and unreasonably refused to supply suitable refreshment (other than intoxicating liquor) or on the ground that the holder of the licence has failed to fulfil any reasonable undertaking given to the justices on the grant or previous renewal of the licence, the justices shall be deemed to have refused the licence on the ground that the premises have been ill-conducted.'"—(*Mr. Solicitor-General.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 40, after the word 'having,' to insert the words 'a separate commission of the peace and.'"—(*Mr. Solicitor-General.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 2, at the end, to insert the words, 'But where quarter sessions have customarily been held separately by adjournment or otherwise for any part of a county as defined by this Act, the Secretary of State may by order, on the application of quarter sessions for the whole county, constitute for the purposes of this Act any part of the county for which quarter sessions are for the time being so separately held a separate county, and the justices usually sitting at such separate quarter sessions a separate quarter sessions, and make all necessary provisions for the administration of the Act in such a case.' (*Mr. Solicitor-General.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 6, after the word 'accordingly,' to insert the words 'and the expression "existing on-licence" means an on-licence in force at the date of the passing of this Act, and includes a licence granted by way of renewal from time to time of a licence so in force, whether such licence continues to be held by the same person, or has been or may be transferred to any other person or persons.'"—(*Mr. Solicitor-General.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 265; Noes, 175. (Division List, No. 233.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allhusen, Augustus H.Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.HonSirH.
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A.J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour,Rt.Hn.GeraldW(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Fred'k. George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beach, Rt. Hn.SirMichaelHicks
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, J.H.M.(DublinUniv.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain,RtHnJ.A.(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H.A.E.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Craig, Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, W. Bromley
Davies, Sir HoratioD(Chatham
Denny Colonel
Dewar, SirT.R.(TowerHamlets
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon.SirJosephC.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland,SirFred Dixon
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Ha
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Fergusson,Rt.Hn.SirJ.(Manc'r.
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hon.EdwardAlgernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S.(Warwick,S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gordon, Hn. J.E. (Elgin&Nairn
Gordon,Maj.Evans-T'rH'mlets
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,SirE.W.(B'ryS.Em'nds.
Greene, HenryD.(Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hardy, Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton(Tynem'th)
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)
Heath, J. (Staffords., N.W.)
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, SirA.(Stafford, W.)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard,John(KentFaversham
Hozier, Hn.J. Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. ArthurFred.
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir J. H.
Kenyon, Hon.Geo.T.(Denbigh)
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, JohnGrant(Yorks.N.R
Lee, Arthur H.(Hants,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower,Fred'k. N.S.
Lockwood, Lieut-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S)
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred

Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, SirLewis(EdinburghW.
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W.F.
Maxwell, RtHnSirH.E.(Wigt'n
Maxwell, W.J.H.(Dumfriesshir
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, RtHn.SirFrederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hn.J.Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan,DavidJ.(Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray,Rt.Hn.A.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan, Col. John P.(Galway,N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J.(Tipperary, N.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Peel, Hn.Wm.RobertWellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederick Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon.M.W.(Stalybridge
Ridley, S.Forde(BethnalGreen
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, James Parker(Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hon.Arthur(Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward J. (Somerset)
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord(Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. HnJ.G.(Oxf'dUniv
Taylor, Austin(East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry, James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, ColSirC.E.H.(Sheffield
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E.(Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G.E. (Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A.Stanley (York E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh.N.)
Wilson-Todd,SirW.H.(Yorks.)
Worsley-Taylor, HenryWilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel
Younger, William

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, Wm. (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Asher, Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, RtHn.HerbertHenry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir J. Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John(Armagh,S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron(Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter(Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry,
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice,Capt.E.C(S.Andrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans,SirF.H.(Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler. Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone, Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt.Hon.SirE.(Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hain, Edward
Harcourt, Lewis V.(Rossendale
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C.E.H. (Bristol, E.)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans(Fife,West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson,Dr.CharlesFredk.

Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, Wm. (Carvarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kemp, Lieut.-Colonel George
Kennedy, VincentP.(Cavan,W.
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid(Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur William(Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Reginald
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mitchell, Edw.(Fermanagh,N.)
Morgan,J.Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Dowd, John
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Prestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Rose, Charles Day
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanhope, HonPhilipJames
Stevenson, Francis, S.
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C.(Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel(Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A.(Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, JohnLawson(Leeds,S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene(Clackmannan)
Wason, JohnCathcart(Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Hudd'd.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Runciman and Mr. Slack.

Question put, "That the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 259; Noes, 164. (Division List, No. 234.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allhusen,Augustus HenryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hn.Sir H.
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon.A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth, R.(Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beach, Rt.Hn.Sir MichaelHicks
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, William James
Burdett-Courts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, J.H.M.(DublinUniv.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain,Rt Hn.J.A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Craig,Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies,Sir HoratioD.(Chatham
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dewar, Sir T.R.(TowerHamlets
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt.Hn. Sir JosephC.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland,Sir FredDixon
Doogan, P. C.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt.Hn.Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants,W.)
Fergusson, Rt.Hn.SirJ.(Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gordon, Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn)
Gordon, Maj. E. (T'r Hamlets)
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,Sir E.W(B'rySEdm'nds
Greene, Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton(Tynem'th)
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.

Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, Jn.(Kent, Faversham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kennaway, Rt.Hn.Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T.(Denbigh)
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks., N.R.
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col.Charles W.(Evesham)
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.)
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M‘Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M‘Iver, SirLewis(Edinburgh,W
M‘Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
M‘Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Majendie, James A. H.
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W.F.
Maxwell,Rt.Hn SirH.E(Wigt'n
Maxwell, W.J.H. (Dumfriessh.
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Mildway, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt.Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan, Col.John.P.(Galway,N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington
Peel, Hn. Wm.RobertWellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon. M.W.(Stalybridge
Ridley, S.Forde(Bethnal Green
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Smith, James Parker(Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas.(Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord(Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M‘Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.Sir C.E.H(Sheffield
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col. A.C.E(Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G.E.(Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh.,N.)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H.(Yorks.)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Asher, Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt.Hn.HerbertHenry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig,Robert Hunter(Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Delany, William
Dobbie, Joseph
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)

Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Capt E.C(SAndrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, SirFrancisH.(Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt.Hn. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hain, Edward
Harcourt, Lewis V.(Rossendale)
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol,E.)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, VincentP.(Cavan,W.
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal,W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (Accrington)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh,N.)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Malley, William
O'Shee, James John
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Stevenson, Francis S.
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen,E.)
Thomas, Sir A.(Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Jn. Lawson (Leeds,S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, JohnCathcart(Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Woodhouse, Sir J.T(Huddersf'd

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

Clause 9:—

Question put, "That the clause stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 280; Noes, 118. (Division List No. 235)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allhusen, Augustus HenryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Asher, Alexander
Asquith, Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hn.Sir H.
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt.Hon. A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beach, Rt.Hn.Sir MichaelHicks
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Burt, Thomas
Butcher, John George
Caldwell, James
Campbell, J.H.M.(DublinUniv.
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W.(Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn.J.A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Craig, Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.)
Crombie, John William
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir HoratioD.(Chatham
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dewar, Sir T.R.(Tower Hamlets
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt.Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir FredDixon
Doogan, P. C.

Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Dyke, Rt. Hon.SirWilliamHart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Evans,SirFrancis H.(Maidstone
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants.,W.)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gladstone, Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Gordon, Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn)
Gordon, Maj. E. (T'r Hamlets)
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, SirE.W(B'rySEdm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Harwood, George
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford,W.)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, Jn.(Kent, Faversham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennaway, Rt.Hn.Sir John H.
Kennedy, VincentP.(Cavan,W.
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T.(Denbigh)
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, J. Grant(Yorks., N.R.
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leng, Sir John
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col.CharlesW.(Evesham)
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.)
Lough, Thomas
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M‘Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M‘Iver,Sir Lewis(Edinburgh,W
M‘Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
M‘Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Majendie, James A. H.
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell,RtHn.Sir H.E(Wigt'n
Maxwell, W.J.H.(Dumfriessh.)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt.Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh,N.)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan, Col.John P.(Galway,N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Peel, Hn.Wm. RobertWellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Price, Robert John
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon. M.W.(Stalybridge
Ridley, S.Forde(Bethnal Green
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Smith, James Parker(Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur(Ormskirk)
Stanley, Edward Jas.(Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord(Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M‘Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Tennant, Harold John
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.Sir C.E.H(Sheffield
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, JohnCathcart(Orkney)
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E(Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G.E.(Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Wilson, A.Stanley(York, E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh.,N.)
Wilson-Todd,Sir W.H. (Yorks.)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Burns, John
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter(Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Delany, William
Dobbie, Joseph
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellice,Capt E.C(SAndrw'sBghs
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co,)
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E.(Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Hain, Edward
Harcourt, Lewis V.(Rossendale
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C.E.H. (Bristol, E.)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal,W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (Accrington)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lundon, W.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Malley, William
O'Shee, James John
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pirie, Duncan V.
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robson, William Snowdon
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Stevenson, Francis S.
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen,E.)
Thomas, Sir A.(Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Woodhouse,Sir J.T(Huddersf'd

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. M'Kenna and Mr. Herbert Roberts.

Schedule:—

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 24, at the end, to add the words 'and in the case of any licensed premises which are certified by the justices of the licensing district on the application of the holder of the licence to be used only as public gardens, picture galleries, exhibitions, places of public or private entertainment, railway refreshment rooms, *bonâ fide* restaurants or eating houses, or for any other purposes to which the holding of a licence is merely auxiliary, such rate, not less than one-third of that charged in other cases, as the justices think proper under the circumstances.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Question put, "That this schedule, as amended, be the first schedule of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 233; Noes, 142. (Division List, No. 236.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allhusen,Augustus HenryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hn.Sir H.
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt.Hon. A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, J.H.M.(DublinUniv.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.

Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain,Rt Hn.J.A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Craig, Charles Curtis(AntrimS.)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, SirHoratioD.(Chatham
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt.Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland,Sir FredDixon
Doogan, P. C.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Dyke, Rt.Hn.Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner Ernest
Garfit, William
Gordon,Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn)
Gordon,Maj.Evans-T'rHamlets
Gore, Hon. S.F.Ormsby-
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,Sir E.W(B'rySEdm'nds
Greene, Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Howard, Jn.(Kent, Faversham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Kennaway, Rt. Hn.Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks., N.R.
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.Charles W.(Evesham)
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.)
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M‘Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M‘Iver,Sir Lewis(Edinburgh,W
M‘Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
M‘Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Majendie, James A. H.
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell,RtHn.SirH.E.(Wigt'n
Maxwell, W.J.H. (Dumfriessh.)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt.Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan, Col.John P.(Galway,N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pease, HerbertPike(Darlington
Peel, Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon. M.W.(Stalybridge
Ridley, S.Forde(Bethnal Green
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F, L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Smith, James Parker(Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley,Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Stanley, Edward Jas.(Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon.Lord(Lancs.)
Stewart,Sir Mark J. M‘Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby,Lt.-Col.A.C.E.(Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G.E.(Notts.)
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H.(Yorks.)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Asher, Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry

Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, John
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Delany, William
Dobbie, Joseph
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice,CaptE.C.(SAndrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Fran. H. (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt.Hn. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hain, Edward
Harcourt, Lewis V.(Rossendale
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol,E.)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy,Vincent P.(Cavan,W.
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal,W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (Accrington)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh,N.)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Malley, William
O'Shee, James John
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen,E.)
Thomas, Sir A.(Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh.,N.)
Woodhouse,Sir J.T(Huddersf'd

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

New Schedule (Scale of Deductions):—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Question, "That this schedule be added to the Bill," put, and agreed to.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Chairman do report the Bill, as amended, to the House."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 211; Noes, 117. (Division List No.237.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allhusen,Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hn.Sir H.
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt.Hon. A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bingham, Lord
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, J.H.M.(DublinUniv.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain,Rt.Hn.J.A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole

Compton, Lord Alwyne
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Doogan, P. C.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants., W.)
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Gordon, Maj. Evans (T'r Hamlets
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E. W. (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Bri'tside
Howard, Jn. (Kent, Faversham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hn. Geo T. (Denbigh)
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks., N.R.
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh, W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, Rt Hn. Sir H. E. (Wigt'n
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Rankin, Sir James
Randles, John S.
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Asher, Alexander
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, John
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Delany, William
Dobbie, Joseph
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Capt. E. C (S Andrw's Bghs

Evans, Sir Fran. H.(Maidstone)
Evans, Samuel T.(Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Griffith, Ellis J.
Hain, Edward
Harcourt, Lewis V.(Rossendale
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P.(Cavan,W.
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh,N.)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Murphy, John
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Malley, William
O'Shee, James John
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Sir HarryS.(Limehouse
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A.(Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh.,N.)
Woodhouse,Sir J.T(Huddersf'd

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. John Ellis and Mr. Corrie Grant.

Bill reported; as amended, to be considered upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 271.]

And, it being One of the clock, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House, pursuant to the Standing Order, without Question put.

Adjourned at One o'clock.

[APPENDICES.

APPENDIX I.

PUBLIC BILLS

DEALT WITH IN VOLUME CXXXVII.

Those marked thus * are Government Bills. The figures in parentheses in the last column refer to the page in this volume. "[H.L.]" following title indicates that the Bill originated in the Lords.

(A.) HOUSE OF LORDS.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*County Courts [H.L.]	*Lord Chancellor*	Read 1ª 7th July (921)
Education (Transferred Schools) [H.L.]	*Lord Bishop of St. Asaph*	Read 2ª 4th July (393)
Hall Marking of Foreign Plate	*Earl of Lytton*	Read 2ª 5th July (604) Committee 8th July (1055) Report 12th July (1327)
*Light Railways [H.L.]	*Lord Wolverton*	Read 3ª and passed 8th July (1055)
*Merchant Shipping [H.L.]	*Lord Wolverton*	Report 30th June (137) Read 3ª and passed 7th July (921)
Merchant Shipping Act (1894) Amendment [H.L.]	*Lord Muskerry*	2nd Reading (defeated) 30t June (112)
*Open Spaces	*Earl of Onslow*	Report 30th June (137) Read 3ª and passed 1st July (313)
Public Health [H.L.]	*Earl Waldegrave*	Read 1ª 8th July (1054)
Railways (Private Sidings)	*Lord Wolverton*	Read 2ª 5th July (603)
Registration of Clubs (Ireland)	*Lord Clonbrock*	Read 2ª 12th July (1327)
*Reserve Forces [H.L.]	*Earl of Donoughmore*	Report 30th June (137) Read 3ª and passed 1st July (313)
Re-Vaccination	*Duke of Northumberland*	Report 7th July (942)
Savings Banks Act Amendment		Read 1ª 11th July (1148)
*Solway Salmon Fisheries [H.L.]	*Earl of Onslow*	Read 1ª 7th July (921)

(B.) HOUSE OF COMMONS—*continued.*

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Bills of Exchange Act (1882) Amendment	*Sir Robert Finlay*	Read 1° 5th July (659)
County of Suffolk	*Sir Cuthbert Quilter*	Read 2° 7th July (1048)
Criminal Aliens	*Sir Howard Vincent*	Read 1° 12th July (1369)
*Dean Forest	*Mr. Victor Cavendish*	Committee Report, Read 3° and passed 1st July (388)
Drunkenness (Ireland)	*Mr. Hugh Law*	Read 1° 30th June (181)
*Irish Land	*Mr. Wyndham*	Read 2° 8th July (1105)
*Isle of Man Customs	*Mr. Victor Cavendish*	Read 1° 12th July (1368)
*Labourers (Ireland)	*Mr. Wyndham*	Motion to commit to Standing Committee 8th July (1094)
*Licensing	*Mr. Akers Douglas*	Committee 29th June (35) (99) Procedure :— (Closure by Compartments) 1st July (320) (Closure by Compartments) 4th July (488) (553) (Closure by Compartments) 5th July (659) Committee 5th July (727) Committee 6th July (809) (870) Committee 11th July (1224) (1279) Committee 12th July (1369) (1424) Committee 13th July (1494) (1553)
*Married Women's Property Act (1882) Amendment	*Sir Robert Finlay*	Read 1° 11th July (1224)
*Post Office Sites.	*Lord Stanley*	Read 1° 11th July (1224)
Savings Bank Act Amendment	*Sir Albert Rollit*	As Amended Considered Read 3° and passed 8th July (1143)
University of Liverpool	*Sir John Brunner*	Read 1° 7th July (983)
Valuation (No. 2)	*Mr. John Hutton*	Read 1° 30th June (181)

APPENDIX II.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, SESSION 1904.

LIST OF RULES, ORDERS, &c., which have been presented during the Session, and are required by Statute to lie for an appointed number of Days upon the Table of the House.

[In continuance of List given in preceding Volume.]

Title of Paper.	Date from which the Period runs.	Period to lie upon the Table.
Post Office Savings Bank (Regulations),—Copy of Post Office Savings Bank (Constantinople and Smyrna) Regulations, 1904 [50 and 51 Vic., c. 40, s. 4]	30 June	40 days
Intermediate Education (Ireland),—Copy of Rule made by the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland appointing the places at which the Examinations for 1904 shall be held [41 and 42 Vic., c. 66, s. 6]	4 July	40 days
Intermediate Education (Ireland),—Copy of Rule made by the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland determining the number of Centre Superintendents to be appointed for the Examinations, 1904 [41 and 42 Vic., c. 66, s. 6]	4 July	40 days
Board of Education,—Copy of Minute of the Board of Education, dated 7th July, 1904, modifying Code of Regulations for Public Elementary Schools, 1904 [33 and 34 Vic., c. 75, s. 97]	7 July	One month
Prisons (England and Wales),—Copy of Draft Rules proposed to be made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department under the Prisons Acts, 1877 and 1898, with respect to the constitution of the Visiting Committee of Borstal Prison [61 and 62 Vic., c. 41, s. 2]	12 July	30 sitting days
Sea Fisheries Regulation Act, 1888,—Copy of Order made by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries, under the provisions of the Act for the variation of the Order creating the North Eastern Sea Fisheries District [51 and 52 Vic., c. 54, s. 1 (4)]	12 July	30 sitting days

INDEX

TO THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

[AUTHORISED EDITION].

EIGHTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1904.

JUNE 29—*JULY* 13

EXPLANATION OF ARRANGEMENT AND ABBREVIATIONS.

Bills: Read First, Second, or Third Time = 1R., 2R., 3R. [*c.*] = Commons. [*l.*] = Lords. *Amendt.* = Amendment. *Os.* = Observations. *Qs.* = Questions. *As.* = Answers. *Com.* = Committee. *Con.* = Consideration. Where in the Index * is added with Reading of a Bill, or a Vote in Committee of Supply, it indicates that no Debate took place on that Stage of the Bill, or on that Vote. Subjects discussed in Committee of Supply are entered under their headings, and also under Members' Names, without reference to the actual Vote before the Committee.

Aberdeen Joint Passenger Station (Order) Confirmation Bill

l. 1R.*. and 2R.* *July 7*, 918, 919.

Aberdeenshire

Swine Fever, absence of—Re-considering Regulations imposed.
Q. Dr. Farquharson; *A.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *June 30*, 163-164.

Abyssinia

United States, Commercial Treaty with,
Q. Major Evans-Gordon; *A.* Earl Percy, *June 29*, 7.

Accession Oath

Transubstantiation, King's Declaration against, *see* Transubstantiation.

Accidents

Cook, Messrs., at Works of—Fencing Machinery.
Q. Mr. Tennant; *A.* Mr A. Douglas, *June 30*, 143.

Covered Vans, with—Comparison of Figures for May, 1903, and 1904—Infringement of New Bye-law.
Q. Sir T. Dewar; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 4*, 447.

Accidents—*cont.*

Electric Railways, on, due to Live Rails—Precautions for Public Safety.
Q. Mr. Channing; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *June 29*, 5-6.

Motors, number caused by, in comparison with those caused by Horses and Horse-drawn Vehicles.
Q. Mr. Scott-Montagu; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 6*, 772.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A.—*Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury* [Somersetshire, Wellington]

Anderson, Constable, Case of, arrangement as to Discussion of, *July 7*, 1047, 1048.

Army Reform proposals—Date of Making Statement, opportunity for discussion, etc., *July 13*, 1492.

Business of the House, Course of, *July 5*, 768.

Licensing Bill.

Date of Taking, *July 8*, 1143.

Position of, on the Order Paper, *July 11*, 1321.

Aden

Hinterland, Affairs in, Information as to.
Q. Sir W. Foster; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 12*, 1351.

Admiralty

First Lord—Earl of Selborne.

Financial Secretary—Mr. E. G. Pretyman.

Courtyard Gateway, Whitehall—Architectural Screen, removing wooden shutters from.
Q. Gen. Laurie; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *July 11*, 1208.

Pensions or Compensation to Workmen permanently disabled—Regulations as to granting.
Qs. Mr. Kearley, *June 30*, 215, 216, 219; Mr. Pretyman, 219.

Adulteration of Food and Drugs

Commission of Inquiry, Recommendations of—Appointment of Expert Officer.
Q. Sir C. Quilter; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *July 6*, 774.

Africa, East

Administratorship of—Resignation of Sir C. Eliot.

Committee of Inquiry into Causes of, suggested.
Q. Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 4*, 455–456.

Correspondence Presented, *July*, 11, 1147, 1185.

Reasons for, etc.—Tabling Papers proposed.
Q. Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 7*, 979.

Alien Settlement.

Eliot, Sir C., Resignation of, *see under subheading* Administratorship.

Grant, Conditions of—Tabling Papers, proposed.
Q. Mr. Bayley; *A.* Earl Percy, *June 30*, 161.
Q. Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 7*, 979.

British Protectorate.

Administration of—Dismissal of Mr. Hopton,-Reason for, etc.
Q. Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Earl Percy, *July 5*, 640.

Estimates for.

Additional particulars, proposed.
Q. Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Earl Percy; *O.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 7*, 957.

Copies for Members.
Q. Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Earl Percy, *July 5*, 641.

East Africa Syndicate, Concessions granted to.
Qs. Mr. Labouchere, Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Earl Percy, *July 29*, 18.

Somaliland, *see that title.*

Africa, South

Boers, Repatriation of, Expenditure on.
Administration of loan, Cost of.
Q. Mr. Buchanan; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 6*, 787.

Detailed Statement, proposed.
Qs. Mr. B. Roberts; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 6*, 786, 787.

Cape of Good Hope Observatory—Report (1903) Presented, *July 4*, 391, 444.

Census Returns of British South Africa Presented, *July 4*, 391, 443.

Constabulary—Strength, Cost, Transvaal Contribution, etc.
Qs. Sir C. Dilke; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 29*, 17; *July 6*, 784, 785.

Crown Agents, Goods shipped by, during past six months, arrangements as to, names of firms employed, and freights paid, etc.
Qs. Earl of Portsmouth, *July 12*, 1330; Duke of Marlborough, 1336, 1337.

Freights to, increase in, owing to operations of the Shipping Ring—Effect on British Shipping trade, etc.
Qs. Earl of Portsmouth, *July 12*, 1330, 1331–1334; Duke of Marlborough, 1333, 1334, 1335.

Government Stores in, Sale of, by Colonel Morgan, Report as to.
Q. Mr. C. Hobhouse: *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 5*, 634.

Milner, Lord, Conspiracy to Murder—Arrests, etc.
Q. Mr. L. Morgan; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 30*, 155–156.

Railways in—Inter-Colonial Council—Resolutions for Improvement of Administration, etc.
Q. Mr. Buchanan; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 5*, 635.

Transvaal, Orange River Colony, etc., *see those titles.*

Agriculture

Profits from, Average annual, in Great Britain.
Q. Mr. E. Wason; *A.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *July 11*, 1207–1208.

Agriculture, Board of

President—Earl of Onslow.

Leaflets 7, 17, 37, 59, and 71, Reprinting.
Q. Mr. A. K. Loyd; *A.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *July 5*, 645–646.

Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department, Ireland

President—Mr. G. Wyndham.

Fisheries — Report (1903) Presented, *July 12*, 1326.

[*cont.*

Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department (Ireland)—*cont.*
Irish Agricultural Organisation Society, Reasons for Payments to.
Qs. Mr. Murphy, Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 792, 793.
Munster Dairy School—Delay in carrying out Improvements.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 647–649.
Officers' Salaries and Travelling Expenses.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 29*, 23.
Organisation Society, Annual Amount paid to, etc.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, Mr. Speaker, *June 29*, 22.
Peat-produced Gas, Establishing Industry of.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 450.
Small Industries, Development of.
Q. Mr. J. F. X. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 173.
Technical Instruction—Officials employed—Return Ordered, *July 7*, 945.
Veterinary Branch — Roman Catholic Clerks, Position of, etc.
Q. Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 170.
Qs. Mr. Delany; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 801, 802.
Vice-President, Position of, as Member of the Government and House of Commons, etc.
Qs. Mr. S. MacNeill, Mr. J Redmond; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 30*, 178–179.
Winter Dairying, Steps to promote.
Qs. Mr. Murphy, Mr. Kilbride, Capt. Donelan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 472–473.
Woodwork Instruction, Training Teachers for—Object of Course, etc.
Q. Mr. J. F. X. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 29*, 23–24.

Ainsworth, Mr. J. S. [Argyll]
Licensing Bill, *Com. June 29*, 99; *July 12*, 1429, 1436; *July 13*, 1568.

Airdrie Corporation Gas Order Confirmation Bill.
l. 3R.* *June 30*, 118.
c. Con. *July 6*, 769.
3R.* *July 8*, 1085.

Alcohol
Manufacturing Purposes, for.
Alteration of present Law proposed.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *July 6*, 790.
Source of Manufacture, Extent of German trade in Alcohol made from bad Materials, &c.
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh, Mr. T. O'Donnell, Maj. Jameson, Mr. Kilbride; *As.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *July 6*, 790, 791.

Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Bill
c. Rep.* *June 30*, 138.

Aliens
Immigration of—Effect on Unemployed Working Classes.
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 11*, 1218–1219.
Paupers, Convicts and Lunatics within the Metropolitan Area, etc.
Q. Sir W. Greene; *A.* Mr. Cochrane, *July 11*, 1207.

Aliens Bill
c. Rep.* *July 7*, 982.
Abandonment of.
Qs. Mr. J. Ellis, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Wallace, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Blake; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 7*, 980, 981.
Re-introduction next Session.
Qs. Mr. F. Ridley, Major Evans Gordon, Mr. Peel; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. Speaker, *July 11*, 1220–1221.

"Allanton," s.s.
Seizure of, by Russians at Vladivostock—Proposed Government Action, etc.
Q. Col. Denny; *A.* Earl Percy, *July 4*, 445–446.
Qs. Mr. Wolff, Mr. J. Devlin, Mr. T. W. Russell; *A.* Earl Percy, *July 4*, 467–468.
Qs. Sir. C. Cayzer, Mr. Wolff, Mr. J. Devlin; *As.* Earl Percy, *July 7*, 956.

Allen, Mr. C. P. [Gloucestershire, Stroud]
Macedonian Gendarmerie — European Officers and Hilmi Pacha's Circular limiting duties, *July 6*, 789.
Transvaal, Importation of Chinese labour to—Advertisements in *Chinese Times*, Authority responsible for, etc., *June 29*, 13.
Volunteers, Retired—Number efficient for not less than three years, *July 6*, 784.

Allotments, Scotland
County and Parish Councils, Proceedings of—Return Presented, *July 8*, 1089.

Ambrose, Dr. R. [Mayo, W.]
London County Council (General Powers) Bill, *con. June 29*, 96, 99.
Medical Services requisitioned by the Police, Fees paid for, *July 5*, 625.

Ancient Monuments, Ireland
Acquisition and Inspection of, by the Board of Works, progress made with.
Q. Sir T. Esmonde, *July 7*, 1018.
Tara, Hill of, Steps taken to prevent excavations on.
Qs. Sir T. Esmonde, *July 7*, 1018; Mr. V. Cavendish, 1024.

Anderson, Constable, Case of
See under Constabulary, Royal Irish.

Anglo-French Convention
See France — Arbitration Treaty with Great Britain.

Annascaul
Valuation of Mr. O'Donnell's Lands—Refunding Excess Taxation.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 452–453.

Animals
Diseases of, *see* Diseases of Animals.

Mines, Horses, etc., in, Cruelty to, Number of prosecutions for, etc.
Q. Mr. B. Robinson; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 7*, 947, 948.

Slaughtering of, Humane methods of, Committee to consider—Report, etc., presented, *July 8*, 1054, 1089.

Ankylostomiasis
Notification of, Rendering compulsory.
Q. Mr. Johnson; *A.* Mr. Cochrane, *July 5*, 643.

Anson, Sir W. R.—*Parliamentary Secretary, Board of Education* [Oxford University]

Grants, New Regulations as to—Hardship to country schools, alleged, *July 6*, 792.

Hygiene, Instruction in, proposed, *July 11*, 1191; *July 13*, 1463, 1464.

Religious Instruction.

Examinations in—Obtaining permission of local authority before suspending school work, *July 12*, 1350.

Non-provided Schools, in, Communicating Regulations as to, *July 5*, 625.

Schools.

Elementary--Grants, New Regulations as to—Hardship to country schools, alleged, *July 6*, 792.

Endowments—Surplus Amounts, Application of, *July 13*, 1464.

Non-provided.

Cheshire County Council and Agreements of teachers, *July 7*, 960, 961.

Religious Instruction in, Communicating Regulations as to, *July 5*, 625.

Teachers in Non-provided Schools—Cheshire County Council and Agreements of teachers, *July 7*, 960, 961.

Whitstable Charity Scheme, *July 7*, 950.

Anthropometry
Ireland—Regulations for taking finger prints, presented, *July 12*, 1326, 1348.

"Antillian," S.S.
Imprisonment of Capt. Wescott at Vera Cruz by order of the Mexican Government—Compensation claim, steps taken by H.M. Government to enforce, etc.
Os. Lord Muskerry, *July 7*, 923; Marquess of Lansdowne, 926, 927.

Antrim
Clerk of the Peace, Amalgamating Office of, with that of Belfast — Saving Effected, etc.
Qs. Mr. J. Devlin, Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 651–652.

Licence Fees, Legality of Charging, for Renewal of Licences, etc.
Q. Mr. J. Delvin; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *June 30*, 164–165.

Arbroath Corporation Water Order Confirmation Bill
c. 2R.* *July 6*, 769.
*Con.** *July 8*, 1085.
3R.* *July 11*, 1182.
l. 1R.* and 2R.* *July 12*, 1325.

Arklow
Harbour—Dredger, Defects of
Os. Sir T. Esmonde, *July 7*, 1022; Mr. V. Cavendish, 1023.

Army
Secretary of State—Mr. H. O. Arnold-Forster.

Under Secretary—Earl of Donoughmore.

Financial Secretary—Mr. W. Bromley-Davenport.

Accoutrements, Decrease in Estimate for, Reasons for Reduction in Stores.
Os. Sir A. Hayter, *June 30*, 203; Mr. B. Davenport, 205.

Artillery.

Guns.

Field, for Volunteer and Militia Artillery, date of supplying.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *June 30*, 182; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 185; Sir J. Colomb, 186.
Os. Sir H. Vincent, *June 30*, 187.

Obsolete Character of.
Os. Maj. Seely; *June 30*, 200, 201.

Quick-firing, Delay in Provision of, etc.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *June 30*, 182; Col. Legge; Mr. J. F. Hope, 187, 188; Mr. B. Davenport, 188; Maj. Seely, 201, 202.

[*cont.*

Army—*cont.*
  Artillery—*cont.*
    Re-armament of, Delay in, etc.
      Os. Sir C. Dilke, *June 30*, 182; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 184; Sir J. Columb, 186; Sir H. Vincent, 187; Maj. Seely, 201, 202.
      Number of Guns Completed, total number required, cost and date of completion, etc.
        Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *June 30*, 155.
    Volunteer and Militia, Date of Supplying Field Guns to.
      Os. Sir C. Dilke, *June 30*, 182; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 185; Sir J. Colomb, 186; Sir H. Vincent, 187.
  Ballykinlor Camp, Tenders for Meat for—Reasons for not Accepting the Lowest Tender.
    Q. Mr. Wood; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 11*, 1198.
  Barracks — Director of Construction, Minute as to Qualifications of, Presented, *July 6*, 770; *July 7*, 920.
  Brennan Torpedoes — Expenditure on, Placed on the Army Estimates, Objections to.
    O. Sir J. Colomb, *June 30*, 196.
    Q. Sir J. Colomb; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 5*, 633, 634.
  Cartridges, Ball and Dummy, Increasing Distinction between, to prevent mistakes in serving out, Proposed.
    Qs. Mr. Coghill; *As.* Mr. B. Davenport, *July 7*, 954, 955.
  Cavalry.
    Saddles and Bridles, reducing weight of, proposed.
      O. Sir C. Rasch, *June 30*, 209.
    Swords supplied to, Uselessness of.
      O. Sir C. Rasch, *June 30*, 209.
  Chatham Military Railway — Reason for Suspension of Work—Cost of Work done, etc.
    Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *July 5*, 636–638.
  Clothing Factory—Pressing Rooms, Ventilation of, Improving conditions, etc.
    Qs. Mr. Shackleton, Sir C. Dilke, Capt. Norton; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *June 29*, 10–11.
  Compulsory Military Service, *see that title.*
  Contracts — Fair Wages Resolution and the Employment of Union or Non-union Workmen — Case of Messrs. Lysaght.
    Qs. Mr. C. Hobhouse, Sir C. Dilke, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. S. Buxton; *As.* Mr. B. Davenport, *July 6*, 782, 783.
    Q. Mr. C. Hobhouse; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *July 13*, 1475.

Army—*cont.*
  Guns.
    Allocation of Orders for New—Proportion given to the Trade, etc.
      Os. Mr. J. F. Hope, *June 30*, 188; Mr. B. Davenport, 190, 206, 207, 208.
    Allotment of Guns captured in South Africa and China—Alleged Refusal of Guns by the London County Council.
      Q. Mr. Coghill; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 7*, 952.
      Q. Mr. Whitmore; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 8*, 1092, 1093.
    Artillery, *see under that subheading.*
    Expenditure on
      Bulk of, placed on the Estimates for 1907, alleged.
        Os. Sir C. Dilke, 182, 189, 190; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 183; Mr. B. Davenport, 189, 190.
      Indian Government, Cost thrown on, etc.
        Os. Sir C. Dilke, *June 30*, 182, 189, 190; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 183; Mr. B. Davenport, 189, 190.
    Machine, Number of, and relative cost of manufacture by the Government and the Trade.
      O. Capt. Norton, *June 30*, 198, 199.
      Q. Capt. Norton; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *July 6*, 782.
  Harness and Saddlery, Decrease in Estimate for, Reasons for reduction in stores.
    Os. Sir A. Hayter, *June 30*, 203; Mr. B. Davenport, 205.
  Horses—Epizootic Lymphangitis, Introduction of, from South Africa—Method employed to eradicate disease, etc.
    Q. Mr. H. Fisher; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 8*, 1093.
    Q. Mr. C. Hobhouse; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *July 13*, 1476.
  India, *see that title.*
  Lances, Decision as to retention of.
    O. Col. Legge, *June 30*, 193.
  Longford Infirmary — Refusal to take urgent Military Cases during Closure of Military Hospital.
    Q. Sir C. Rasch; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *July 11*, 1217–1218.
  Medical Corps, Promotion of Junior Officer—Communicating Reasons for Selection to Officers passed over.
    Q. Dr. Thompson; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 11*, 1197–1198.
  Medical Department—Cost of Annual Report, Date of presenting—Cause of Delay, etc.
    Q. Mr. C. Hobhouse; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 5*, 634–635.

[*cont*

Army—*cont.*

Militia, Volunteers and Yeomanry, *see those titles.*

Mountmellick — Closure of the "Cut" by Military Authorities—Allowing Removal of Peat, etc.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *July 11*, 1217.

Mowatt Committee—Summary of Report, etc. Date of presenting to Members.
Q. Mr. Buchanan; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *June 29*, 11–12.

Officers.
Commissions, Purchase of—Transfer of Sum paid on Transfer to Indian Army.
Q. Sir Seymour King; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *June 30*, 152.

Medical Corps—Promotion of Junior Officer, Reasons for.
Q. Dr. Thompson; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 11*, 1197, 1198.

Salisbury, Officers warned for removal from.
Q. Sir W. Palmer; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 11*, 1197.

Paymasters, Terms of Retirement of.
Q. Mr. Moon; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 5*, 634.

Reform, Proposals — Date of Making Statement, Opportunity for Discussion, etc.
Q. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 7*, 979, 980.
Qs. Sir A. Hayter, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. W. Churchill; *As.* Sir A. Acland, Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 13*, 1492, 1493.

Remount Depôt, Purchase of Land at Bitterne for.
Q, Mr. Lambert; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *July 5*, 638.

Rifles.

Lee-Enfield, Defects of, loss of life due to, etc.
O. Captain Norton, *June 30*, 196, 197.

Manufacture of, at Enfield, Birmingham and London 1889-1894—Subcontracting — Wages paid by Private Firms, etc.
Q. Mr. Shackleton; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 11*, 1196–1197.

New Pattern.

Barrel, Length of.
Os. Col. Nolan, *June 30*, 203, 204; Col. Blundell, 204.

Defects of, Strength of Recoil, etc.
Os. Captain Norton, *June 30*, 197, 198; Mr. Hunt, 199; Major Seely, 200; Col. Nolan, 203, 204.

Army—*cont.*

Rifles—*cont.*

New Pattern—*cont.*

Shooting Experiments with—Comparison with Old Rifle, etc.
O. Mr. B. Davenport, *June 30*, 205.

Testing of.
O. Mr. Hunt, *June 30*, 199.

Relative Cost of Manufacture by the Government and the Trade.
Os. Mr. C. Warner, *June 30*, 195; Mr. B. Davenport, 205, 206; Col. Bowles, 208.

Salisbury, Officers warned for Removal from.
Q. Sir W. Palmer; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 11*, 1197.

Sandhurst Military College — Fees for Preliminary Examination.
Q. Sir C. Rasch; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *June 30*, 154–155.

Staff Appointments.

Captains doing work of Majors without corresponding rank and pay.
Os. Lord Heneage, *July 8*, 1059, 1060, 1068; Earl of Donoughmore, 1068.

Deficiency in, Increase in Number of Officers Proposed.
Os. Lord Heneage, *July 8*, 1055, 1056, 1057; Lord Lovat, 1061, 1063, 1064; Earl of Donoughmore, 1066; Lord Tweedmouth, 1070.

Duties, Interchange of duties between Regiments and the Staff, proposed.
Os. Lord Heneage, *July* 8, 1056.

Lack of knowledge of.
Os. Lord Heneage, *July 8*, 1056.

First and Second Year Course at the College, difference between.
O. Earl of Donoughmore, *July* 8, 1065.

India, Establishment of College in, proposed.
O. Earl of Donoughmore, *July 8*, 1067.

Limitation of Term of.
Os. Lord Heneage, *July 8*, 1058; Earl of Donoughmore, 1069.

Regimental Officers, Granting Increased Facilities for Qualifying for the Staff, Proposed.
Os. Lord Heneage, *July 8*, 1056, 1057, 1058; Lord Lovat, 1063; Earl of Donoughmore, 1065, 1066, 1067.

Seconding of Officers above the rank of Captain in the Artillery and Cavalry.
Os. Lord Heneage, *July 8*, 1055, 1058–1060; Earl of Donoughmore, 1067, 1068.

[*cont.*

Army—*cont.*

Yeomanry, Number of Staff Officers available for.
O. Lord Lovat, *July 8*, 1062.

Submarine Mines, Questionable Policy of Placing under Control of the War Office.
O. Sir J. Colomb, *June 30*, 196.

Transport Vehicles, Decrease in Estimate for—Reasons for Reduction in Stores.
Os. Sir A. Hayter, *June 30*, 203; Mr. B. Davenport, 205.

Wicklow Camp, Canteen Licence—Action of Mr. Shanks.
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 170–171; *July 11*, 1215.

Army Estimates

Warlike and other stores, Supply and Repair of—£2,839,000, Rep., *June 30*, 181.

Arnold-Forster, Mr. H. O.—*Secretary of State for War* [Belfast, W.]

Africa, South, Government Stores in, Report as to Sale of, by Colonel Morgan, *July 5*, 634.

Ballykinlor Camp, Meat Tenders for—Reason for not accepting Lowest Tender, *July 11*, 1198.

Guns.

Allotment of Guns captured in South African and China Campaigns—Alleged refusal of Guns by the London County Council, *July 7*, 952; *July 8*, 1093.

Artillery, Re-armament of, Cost of, and date of Completion, etc., *June 30*, 155, 184.

Expenditure on—Cost thrown on the Indian Government, etc., *June 30*, 183.

Militia and Volunteer Artillery, Provision of Guns for, *June 30*, 185.

Re-armament of Horse and Field Artillery, Progress made in, *June 30*, 155, 184, 186.

Horses—Epizootic Lymphangitis, Introduction of, from South Africa—Method employed to Eradicate Disease, etc., *July 8*, 1093.

Illig, Capture of—Use of Explosive Bullets, *June 29*, 9.

Indian Army.

Drafts—Number of Men with less than Five Years to Serve, *July 13*, 1470–1472.

Guns to be Completed for, in present Financial Year, *June 30*, 155.

Trooping Season—Regiments destined for India, etc., *June 30*, 154.

Medical Corps—Promotion of Junior Officer—Reasons for, *July 11*, 1197–1198.

Arnold-Forster, Mr. H. O.—*cont.*

Medical Department — Cost of Annual Report—Date of Presenting, *July 5*, 635.

Militia.

Artillery Corps.

Mobilisation — Conveyance from the North to Portsmouth, Estimated Cost of, *July 6*, 779.

Training—Guns and Appliances in use at Local Headquarters, *July 6*, 779.

North Staffordshire, 4th Battalion—Accident to Private Hill, *June 30*, 154.

South African War Service—Adding South Africa to Colours, *July 4*, 453.

Officers.

Commissions, Purchase of—Transfer of Sum Paid on Transfer to Indian Army, *June 30*, 152.

Medical Corps, Promotion of Junior Officer, Reasons for, etc., *July 11*, 1197–1198.

Salisbury, Officers Warned for Removal from, *July 11*, 1197.

Paymasters, Terms of Retirement of, *July 5*, 634.

Rifles, Manufacture of, at Enfield, Birmingham and London, 1889–1894—Subcontracting, etc., *July 11*, 1196–1197.

Salisbury, Officers Warned for Removal from, *July 11*, 1197.

Sandhurst Military College — Fees for Preliminary Examination, *June 30*, 155.

Torpedo Destroyers — Expenditure on Brennan Establishments, *July 5*, 633–634.

Volunteers.

Camping out—Return of a Brigade in 1900, in Consequence of Rain, Alleged, *July 4*, 458.

City of London Imperial Volunteers—Conditions of Service in South Africa, *June 30*, 152.

Rifle Ranges — Number Constructed since 1899, cost, &c., *July 6*, 784.

Artillery

See under Army.

Ashbourne, Lord — *Lord Chancellor of Ireland*

Anderson, Constable—Charges against, and dismissal from the Force — Tabling Papers relating to, *July 12*, 1343, 1344, 1345.

Ashburton, Lord
Yeomanry.
Arming of, deficiencies in—Objections to the Bayonet, etc., *July 5*, 606–608.
Character of, as a Mounted Force, *July 5*, 607.

Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. H. [Fife, E.]
Licensing Bill.
Com., *June 29*, 75, 79, 101; *July 5*, 753; *July 6*, 837, 891; *July 7*, 1271, 1274, 1388, 1400, 1401; *July 13*, 1546, 1547.
Procedure Resolution, *July 1*, 331, 336, 371.

Atherley-Jones, Mr. L. [Durham, N.W.]
Licensing Bill.
Com., *June 29*, 74.
Procedure Resolution, *July 4*, 557.

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. J.—*Attorney-General for Ireland* [Londonderry, N.]
Kingstown and Dalkey Polling Districts—Complaints as to Tampering with Forms, *July 11*, 1209.
Liquor Licensing, etc.—Fees Charged at Antrim and Belfast for Renewal of Licences, etc., *June 30*, 165.
Omagh—Removal of Street Obstructions, *July 12*, 1350.
Probates, Delay in Granting, in Dublin, Alleged, *July 7*, 961.
Rathmines Polling District—Complaints as to Tampering with Forms, etc., *July 4*, 471; *July 11*, 1209.

Attorney-General
Sir Robert B. Finlay.

Attorney-General for Ireland
Mr. J. Atkinson.

Australia
Magazines, Import Duty on—Alleged Notification by Commonwealth Government.
Q. Mr. Runciman; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 6*, 780, 781.

Austria-Hungary
Trade Report Presented, *June 30*, 119.

Bagot, Capt. J. F. [Westmoreland, Kendal]
Telephone Service—Villages and Market Towns, Intercommunication between, *July 5*, 642.

Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill
c. Lords' Amendments *Con.* July 4*, 438.

Balance Sheets, Fraudulent
Bill to Amend Law as to, Date of Introducing.
Qs. Mr. T. W. Russell; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 4*, 487.

Balcarres, Lord, [Lancashire, Chorley]
Admiralty Courtyard Gateway, Whitehall—Architectural Screen, Removing Wooden Shutters from, *July 11*, 1208.
British Museum—Bronze Lions Removed from Railings, Disposal of, *July 6*, 773.
Burlington House, Colonnade Removed from—Re-erection proposed, *July 6*, 773.
Hyde Park Corner, Slippery State of Wood Pavement at—Provision of Gravel Proposed, *July 6*, 773.
Palaces.
Holyrood, Condition of, Expenditure on Improvements, etc., *June 30*, 230.
Maintenance and Repairs, Cost of, *June 30*, 230.
St. James's, Wine Cellars at, Expenditure on Improvements to, *June 30*, 229.
Parks and Gardens—Traffic Regulations—Enforcing Ten-Mile Limit for Horse-drawn Vehicles, *July 5*, 645.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J.—*First Lord of the Treasury* [Manchester, E.]
Africa, East.
Administration of—Resignation of Sir C. Eliot.
Inquiry into, Proposed, *July 4*, 456.
Tabling Papers Proposed, *July 7*, 979.
Alien Settlement—Conditions of Grant, Tabling Papers Proposed, *July 7*, 979.
Aliens Bill, Abandonment of, *July 7*, 980, 981.
Re-introduction next Session, *July 11*, 1220-1221.
Army Reform—Date of Making Statement, *July 7*, 980.
Balance Sheets, Fraudulent, Bill to amend Law as to, Date of Introducing, *June 4*, 487.
Behring Sea Seal Fisheries, Protection of, by British Warship—Assent of Japanese and Russian Governments, Question of International Law, etc., *July 7*, 978, 979
Birthday Honours List—Official Announcement as Prime Minister's List, Precedent for, *June 30*, 177.
Business of the House, Course of, *July 4*, 488; *July 6*, 807; *July 7*, 980; *July 11*, 1224.
Coaling Belligerent Warships at English Stations, *July 11*, 1220.

[*cont.*

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J.—*cont.*

- Colonial Office Vote, Date of taking, *July 11*, 1223, 1224; *July 13*, 1490, 1491.
- Defence of the Empire—Committee of Defence, Participation of Lord Curzon in proceedings of, *July 6*, 805.
- Education Acts, 1902-1903—Rates, Refusals to pay—"Passive Resisters," Course of Action as to, *July 6*, 805, 806.
- Education (Scotland) Bill, Date of taking, *June 29*, 10.
- Finance Bill, Date of proceeding with, *July 4*, 487.
- Foreshore Reclamation, Scheme for, Appointing Departmental Committee to consider, *July 11*, 1219.
- France—Arbitration Treaty with Great Britain, Particulars as to—Postponement of Questions for a short period, *July 6*, 803.
- Labourers (Ireland) Act Amendment Bill, Referring to Committee proposed, *July 6*, 804.
- Law Officers of the Crown, Salaries and Fees of, allowing Opportunity for Discussing, *July 11*, 1199.
- Licensing Bill.
    - *Com., June 29*, 38, 39, 78, 107, 109, 112, 115; *July 11*, 1239, 1243; *July 12*, 1373, 1381, 1383, 1400, 1402, 1433–1436, 1438; *July 13*, 1550.
    - Motion, Giving Due Notice of, *June 30*, 180–181.
    - Penalties for not providing Reasonable Refreshment—Complying with Requirements of Magistrates, *July 11*, 1220.
    - Procedure Resolutions, *July 1*, 320, 321, 344, 345, 362, 373, 375, 378; *July 4*, 491–493, 495, 496, 507, 508, 511, 515, 518, 522, 525, 560; *July 5*, 663, 669, 683, 686–688, 696, 705.
- Parliamentary Elections—Redistribution of Seats Bill, Prospects of, *July 1*—1221–1222.
- Port of London Bill, Date of taking—Removing Discharge from Order Book—Opposition to, etc., *July* 11, 1223.
- Queen Anne's Bounty Fund, Date of introducing Bill for re-constructing, *July 7*, 952.
- Taxation, Inquiry into Incidence of, Appointing Select Committee for, *June 29*, 31.
- Thames Barrage Scheme, appointing Departmental Committee to consider, *July 11*, 1219.
- Tibet Expedition, Information as to, *July 6*, 806.
- Tobacco Duties, Date of resumption of debate on, *July 6*, 804.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J.—*cont.*

- Transvaal, Administration of—Self-governing Colony, treatment as, *July 13*, 1489, 1490.
- Trinity College, Dublin—Administration, Method of Government, Revenue, etc., Return as to, proposed, *July 7*, 975, 976.
- Unemployed, dealing with Question of, during Recess, etc., *July 11*, 1218-1219.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W.—*President of the Board of Trade* [Leeds, Central]

- Electric Power, Supply of, to Districts, Date of presenting Return as to, *July 11*, 1192.
- Ireland, Railways in, *see under subheading* Railways.
- Lace, Counterfeit, made in Switzerland and sold as Irish-made lace, alleged, *July 13*, 1478.
- Merchant Shipping.
    - Foreign Sailors on British Ships—"Southern Cross"—Proposed Government Action, *June 30*, 161–162.
    - "Homewood," Mutiny on, alleged, *July 12*, 1358.
    - Squadron of Warships, Board of Trade Warning as to Danger in approaching, *July 11*, 1205–1206.
- Railways.
    - Electric, Accidents due to Live Rails—Precautions for Public Safety, *June 29*, 6; *July 4*, 470.
    - Ireland.
        - Excursion Trains, Lack of Sanitary Accommodation on, alleged, *July 7*, 959.
        - Great Northern—Carriage of Parcels from Tynan to Glasgow—Rates Charged, *July 4*, 445.
        - Great Southern and Western (Ireland), Closing of Glounbawn Level Crossing by, *July 4*, 486.
    - Signal Alarm, New Pattern of, Direct Attention of Companies to, *June 30*, 145–146.
- Trade and Commerce, Statistical Abstract for United Kingdom (1903), Date of Publication, etc., *July 13*, 1478.

Balfour of Burleigh, Lord

- Great Eastern Railway Bill—Agreement as to Conveyance of Post Office Servants and Mails by Motor Cars, *July 8*, 1052–1054.

Ballinacross

- Robinson, Mr. J., Farm of—Application for Sale.
    - *Q.* Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 776.

June 29—July 13.

Ballinagore
Evicted Farm at, Police Protection of Herd on.
Q. Mr. Sullivan ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 148.

Ballinascarthy
Railway, Light, to Timoleague—County Guarantee, Levying Rate to pay Dividend on.
Q. Mr. McFadden ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 631.

Ballinasloe
Asylum.
Board of, Arbitrary Changes effected by
O. Col. Saunderson, *July 7*, 1030.
Kirwan, Dr., Appointment of, as Medical Superintendent.
Reasons for passing over Dr. Mills, Influence of Catholic Association, etc.
Os. Mr. Sloan, *July 7*, 1026–1028 ; Col. Nolan, 1029–1030 ; Col. Saunderson, 1031–1034 ; Mr. Wyndham, 1034, 1042, 1043 ; Mr. J. Devlin, 1035 ; Mr. C. Craig, 1039, 1040.
Sanction of Lord-Lieutenant.
Os. Mr. Sloan, *July 7*, 1027 ; Col. Nolan, 1029 ; Col. Saunderson, 1031 - 1033 ; Mr. C. Craig, 1040 ; Mr. Wyndham, 1042, 1043 ; Mr. W. Moore, 1044, 1045.
Collins, Dr., Salary of, as Medical Officer.
Q. Dr. Thompson ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 13*, 1467.
Union Medical Officer, Increase of Salary of, Reason for Refusal, etc.
Qs. Mr. Roche, Mr. Flavin ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 800, 801.
Q. Dr. Thompson ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 13*, 1467.

Ballingeary
Police Force at—Abolishing Barracks.
Q. Mr. Sheehan ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 166.

Balleybofry
Donegal Railway Company, Refusal of, to allow Through Bookings of Goods to and from.
Q. Mr. McFadden ; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *June 30*, 150–151.

Ballydonlon Estate, Galway
Sale of—Increase in Instalment Rentals—Holding Inspection, etc.
Q. Mr. Roche ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 472.

Ballykinlor Camp
Meat Tenders for—Reason for not Accepting lowest Tender.
Q. Mr. Wood ; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 11*, 1198.

Ballymacrossin Estate
Sale of—Reinstatement of Evicted Tenant.
Q. Mr. Delany ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 963, 964.

Ballymahan
Inspection of Weights and Measures, Selecting convenient Time for.
Q. Mr. Farrell ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 29*, 26.

Ballymena
Telephone Service between Londonderry and, Establishing.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 29*, 6.

Ballynaclocha
National School—Income of Principal Teacher.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 448–449.
Q. Mr. P. A. McHugh ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 630.

Ballynahinch
Fishing rights, Illegal interference with, by Water Bailiffs, alleged.
Q. Mr. Sloan ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 795.

Banbury, Sir F. G. [Camberwell, Peckham]
Licensing Bill, *Com., July 13*, 1555.

Banff
Swine Fever, Absence of—Re-considering Regulations imposed.
Q. Dr. Farquharson ; *A.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *June 30*, 163–164.

Bangor, Ireland
Post Office, Improvement of, proposed.
Q. Mr. J. Devlin ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 13*, 1489.

Bangor, Wales
Harbour, Provision of, question of Grant, etc.
O. Mr. T. L. Corbett, *July 7*, 1024.

Banks
Loan Fund, Ireland—Debenture Holders, Refunding money lost by.
Q. Dr. Thompson ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 11*, 1193.

Barlow, Mr. J. E. [Somerset, Frome]
Licensing Bill Procedure Resolution, *July 4*, 546.

Barrow-in-Furness Corporation Bill
c. Con. July 6*, 769.
3R.* *July 11*, 1181.

Barry Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill
c. 2R.* *July 6*, 769.

Bartley, Sir G. C. T. [Islington, N.]
Licensing Bill Procedure Resolution, *July 1*, 377.

Bateman Estate, Tralee

Gale Rents, Demand for—Forcing Tenants to accept Landlord's Terms, etc.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 167–169.

Bathurst, Earl

Education Grants, Change in system of, by Article 31 of Code for 1904—Loss entailed on Local Education Authorities, etc., *July 12*, 1339.

Militia—Compulsory Service, Proposed revival of, *July 11*, 1164, 1165.

Bawnboy

Humphreys, Mr., Tenants of, Recovery of Rent from — Judgments set aside —Protection of Tenants, etc.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 476–477.

Bayley, Mr. T. [Derbyshire, Chesterfield]

Africa, East, Alien Settlement in—Tabling Terms of proposed Grants, etc., *June 30*, 161.

Pemba—Result of appeal of freed slave Mshangama against decision of Commissioner, *July 7*, 957.

Silver Coinage for Crown Colonies, minting of — Commissions paid to Crown Agents, etc., *June 30*, 146; *July 13*, 1480.

Behring Sea

Seal Fisheries, Protection of, by British Warship—Assent of Japanese and Russian Governments, Question of International Law, etc.
Qs. Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 7*, 977–979.

Belfast

Children's Court, Establishment of.
Qs. Mr. H. Law, Mr. Sloan; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 962.

Clerk of the Peace, amalgamating Office of, with that of Antrim — Saving effected, etc.
Qs. Mr. J. Devlin, Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 651–652.

Dee Street, Insanitary Condition of.
Q. Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 484.

Infectious Diseases, Outbreaks of.
Refuse, Disposal of, on building ground, Prohibition of, proposed.
Q. Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 797, 798.

Smallpox Outbreak — Negligence of City Council—Bringing Pressure to bear on Council, etc.
Q. Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 29*, 28.

Kelvin House — Number of Candidates passing B.A. examination at Royal University (1899–1903).
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 13*, 1460–1462, 1482.

Belfast—*cont.*

Licence Fees, Annual Amount of, etc — Fees charged for Renewal of Licences.
Q. Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *June 30*, 164–165.

Neeson, Mr. J. C., Pension of—Amount, basis of calculation, etc.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 8*, 1092.

Police Appointments—Preference given to Roman Catholics, alleged.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 777.

Post Office.

London Mails from, Delay in Delivery of.
Q. Mr. C Craig; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 4*, 486.

Money Order Counter Funds, Exhaustion of.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 4*, 484–485.

Supplementary Mail Service to England leaving at 6.45 p.m., authorising.
Q. Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 4*, 485–486.

Queen's College.

Lectures on Music and Sound abandoned for want of audiences, alleged.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 12*, 1363.

Number of Candidates passing B.A. examination at Royal University (1899–1903).
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 13*, 1460–1462, 1482.

Pavement and Organ, Cost of.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *July 13*, 1482, 1483.

Scholarships, Lapsed—Number, Cause of Lapse, etc.
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 13*, 1483.

Session, duration of, Appointments outside College held by Professors, etc.
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 12*, 1362, 1363.

Belfast and North-East Ireland Electricity and Power Gas Bill

l. Rep.* *July 11*, 1146.

Bell, Mr. R. [Derby]

Indian Army — Small Arms Factory, establishment of — Cost, Effect on Expenditure on Supplies from Private Firms, etc., *July 8*, 1091.

Licensing Bill Procedure Resolution, *July 4*, 588.

Benn, Mr. J. W. [Devonport]
Tyneside Tramways and Tramroads Bill, *Con.*, *June 30*, 245, 250.

Beri-Beri
Port of London, Prevalence in—Precautions taken.
Q. Col. Legge; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *June 30*, 147.
Transvaal, *see title* Transvaal — Chinese Labour.

Bhownaggree, Sir M. M. [Bethnal Green, N.E.]
India.
Labourers in Mines and Plantations, Granting Return as to, *June 30*, 161.
Statistical Department, Annual Expenditure on, etc., *June 30*, 160.
Natal, Indians in, Suicide among, *June 30*, 157.
Transvaal.
British Indians, Trading Privileges of.
Colonial Restrictive Legislation, etc., *July 8*, 1093.
Supreme Court, Decision of, as to—Alleged Statement of Sir A. Lawley, etc., *June 30*, 156.

Bignold, Sir A. [Wick Burghs]
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *July 6*, 812.

Bills of Exchange Act (1882) Amendment Bill.
c. 1R* *July 5*, 659.

Birkdale Improvement Bill
c. Lords' Amendts, *Con.** *July 7*, 942.

Birmingham
Small Arms Factory—Number of Rifles Manufactured and Cost per Head, 1889–1894.
Q. Mr. Shackleton; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 11*, 1196–1197.

Birthday Honours List
Official Announcement as Prime Minister's List, Precedent for.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 30*, 177–178.

Bitterne
Remount Depôt, Purchase of Land for.
Q. Mr. Lambert; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *July* 5, 638.

Black, Mr. A. W. [Bannffshire]
Licensing Bill, *Com. July 11*, 1265, 1268.
Workhouses, Aged Poor as Inmates of, Proportion of, to those receiving Outdoor Relief, Increase in, *July 11*, 1188.

Blacklion
Dispensary, Improvement in Condition of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Jordan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 799, 800.

Blake, Mr. E.—*Temporary Chairman of Committees* [Longford, S.]
Aliens Bill, Abandonment of, *July 7*, 981.

Blakeney Estate, Galway
Agent of—Taking Advantage of Land Purchase Act, etc.
Q. Mr. Roche, *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 650.
Position of, in Land Judge's Court—Name of Agent or Receiver.
Q. Mr. Roche; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 174.

Blennerhassett Estate, Kerry
Banks, Up-keep of, Authority responsible for, etc.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 29*, 27.
Sale of—Reinstatement of evicted tenant.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 795.

Blundell, Col. H. B. H. [Lancashire, Ince]
Army—Rifles, New Pattern—Length of Barrel, *June 30*, 204.

Board of Agriculture
See Agriculture, Board of.

Board of Education
See Education, Board of.

Board of Trade
See Trade, Board of.

Board of Works, Ireland
See Works, Board of, Ireland.

Boland, Mr. J. [Kerry, S.]
Education.
Cheshire County Council and Agreements of Teachers in non-provided Schools, *July 7*, 960, 961.
Keelnabrach School, Dangerous Condition of, alleged, Delay in building new School, etc., *July 13*, 1484.
Lettir (Kerry) School — Delay in producing new Plans, alleged, *July 13*, 1484.
Fish, Cured, American Import Duties on—Inducing withdrawal, proposed, *July 7*, 967.
Glen (Kerry) Boat Slip, Expenditure on, *July 12*, 1364.
Irish Language, Examination in, for Postal Officials, proposed—Resolutions passed by Local Bodies, etc., *July 12*, 1366, 1367.
Kerry, South, Congested Estates offered for Sale in—Price demanded, etc., *July 4*, 478-479.
Lace, Counterfeit, sold in Nice as Irish-made lace, alleged, *July 13*, 1478.
McGillicuddy Estate, Sale of—Exclusion of certain Tenants, *July 4*, 483.

[cont.

Boland, Mr. J.—*cont.*
- Malta.
  - Balance Sheet of Government, Tabling—Surplus Revenue, etc., *July 4*, 453, 466; *July 7*, 955; *July 12*, 1357.
  - Charities and Hospitals, Government Expenditure on, etc., *June 30*, 158.
- Valentia Ferry, Improvement of—Delay in formulating scheme, alleged, *July 7*, 966.

Bond, Mr. E. [Nottingham, E.]
- Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *July 12*, 1441.

Borstal Prison
- Visiting Committee, Draft Rules as to, Presented, *July 12*, 1326, 1348.
- Warders, Attacks on, Conduct of Prison, etc.
  - *Qs.* Dr. Macnamara, Sir E. Flower; *As.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 13*, 1479, 1480.

Boscawen, Capt. A. S. T. G. [Kent, Tunbridge]
- Whitstable Charities Scheme, Local Opposition to, etc., *July 1*, 317; *July 6*, 775, 776.

Bournemouth Corporation (Tramways) Bill
- c. Rep.* *July 7*, 943.

Bousfield, Mr. W. R. [Hackney, N.]
- Licensing Bill.
  - *Com. June 29*, 73, 79, 100, 101, 103; *July 6*, 887; *July 11*, 1283; *July 13*, 1567.
  - Procedure Resolution, *July 4*, 572.
- London County Council (General Powers) Bill, *Con. June 29*, 95.

Bowles, Col. H. E. [Middlesex, Enfield]
- Army—Rifles—Relative Cost of Manufacture by the Government and the Trade, *June 30*, 208.

Bowles, Mr. T. G. [Lynn Regis]
- Behring Sea Seal Fisheries, Protection of, by British Warship — Assent of Japanese and Russian Governments, Question of International Law, &c., *July 7*, 977, 978.
- Cunard Agreement, Date of Taking, *July 6*, 807.
- Customs and Excise—New Taxes, Date of Enforcing, &c., *July 7*, 958.
- France—Arbitration Treaty with Great Britain, Particulars as to—Postponement of Questions for a short Period, *July 6*, 802, 803.
- Hyde Park—Row, Extension of, Proposed, *June 30*, 232.

Bowles, Mr. T. G.—*cont.*
- Licensing Bill.
  - *Com. June 29*, 40; *July 12*, 1405; *July 13*, 1531, 1547, 1548.
  - Clauses 3 and 4, Submitting, to a Money Committee, *July 11*, 1223.
  - Procedure Resolution, *July 1*, 377; *July 5*, 662, 693.
- Merchant Shipping — Squadron of Warships, Board of Trade Warning as to Danger in Approaching, *July 11*, 1205.
- Navy.
  - "Centurion" H.M.S., Defective Condition of Gun Sights of, *July 11*, 1199–1200.
  - Coal, Supply of, to Foreign Warships, Regulations as to, *June 30*, 222; *July 11*, 1219–1220.
  - Oil Fuel, Supply of, *June 30*, 222.
  - "Prince of Wales," H.M.S., Old-fashioned Pattern of Gun Sights of, etc., *July 11*, 1200, 1201.
  - Scouts, Purposes and Success of, *June 30*, 222.
- Navy Estimates — Shipbuilding Resolutions, Financial effect of passing, etc., *June 30*, 214, 215.
- Palaces, Royal, Cost of Maintenance and Repairs of, *June 30*, 228.
- Supply Services, Issues from Consolidated Fund for, Acts governing, etc., *June 29*, 19–20.
- Sweets containing Spirits, imported from the Continent, Restricting Sale of, proposed, *July 6*, 790.
- Tibet Expedition, Information as to, *July 6*, 806.

Brazil
- Trade Report, Presented, *July 8*, 1054.

Bridlington Corporation Bill
- c. 1R.* *June 30*, 139.
  - 2R.* *July 11*, 1182.

Brigg, Mr. J. [Yorkshire, W. R., Keighley]
- Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 53; *July 6*, 822.

Bristol
- Telegraph Office—Season Substitutes, rate of payment of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Shackleton; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 7*, 948.

Bristol, Bishop of
- Transubstantiation, King's Declaration against—Alteration in form of Oath proposed, *July 1*, 296.

Bristol Corporation Bill
- c. Rep.* *July 7*, 943.

Bristol Tramways (Extensions) Bill
- c. 2R.* *July 11*, 1182.

British Flag

Protection of Persons Travelling on Vessels Flying the British Flag.
Q. Lord Muskerry; *A.* Marquess of Lansdowne, *July 12*, 1327.

British India Steam Navigation Co.

Shipping Ring, joining—Effect on Carriage of Goods to South Africa, etc.
Os. Earl of Portsmouth, *July 12*, 1329; Duke of Marlborough, 1332, 1333; Earl Grey, 1333, 1338, 1339.

British Museum

Bronze Lions removed from Railings, Disposal of.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *July 6*, 773.

Broadhurst, Mr. H. [Leicester]

Army Contracts—Fair Wages Resolution and the Employment of Union or Non-union Workmen—Case of Messrs. Lysaght, *July 6*, 783.

Cromer Post Office, Charge on Letters Addressed to, *July 7*, 949.

Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 40; *July 5*, 740; *July 12*, 1376; *July 13*, 1555, 1560.

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John F.—*Secretary of State for India*, [Surrey, Guildford]

Aden Hinterland, Information as to Affairs in, *July 12*, 1351.

Army.

Assistant Military Secretary, Appointment of, *July 11*, 1204.

Courts Martial — Deputy Judge Advocate, Regulations as to Attendance of, *July 6*, 780.

Small Arms Factory, Establishment of—Cost, Effect on Expenditure on Supplies from Private Firms, etc., *July 8*, 1091.

Cable Rate—Obtaining further Reductions, *June 30*, 147–148.

Golden Book, Official Authority for, *June 30*, 148.

Labourers in Mines and Plantations, Granting Return as to, *June 30*, 161.

Liquor and Drugs, Increasing Consumption of—Preventive Legislation, *June 29*, 9, 17–18.

Panna, Administration of—Reason for Suspending Chief, etc., *June 30*, 160.

Statistical Department, Annual Expenditure on, etc., *June 30*, 161.

Tibet Expedition.

Armistice, Request for—Empowering British Commander to Treat with Negotiators, etc., *July 4*, 466.

Cost, Payment of—Relief of India Proposed, *July 13*, 1467.

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John F.—*cont.*

Tibet Expedition—*cont.*

Progress of Negotiations, Character of Expedition, Government Policy, etc., *July 6*, 914, 915, 916; *July 7* 955, 956.

Status of Tibet, Chinese Rights—Power to make Treaty with Great Britain, *July 11*, 1203–1204.

Brussels

Maritime Conference at—Representation of Great Britain at.

Deputation from Shipping Associations, etc.
Os. Lord Muskerry, *July 7*, 927; Marquess of Lansdowne, 929.

Refusal of Great Britain to be Officially Represented—Reason.
Q. Mr. C. McArthur; *A.* Earl Percy, *July 4*, 468.

Bryce, Rt. Hon. J. [Aberdeen, S.]

Education—Scotch System, Introduction of, in England and Wales, etc., *July 13*, 1492.

Licensing Bill.

Com., *July 11*, 1256.

Motion of Mr. A. J. Balfour, Giving due Notice of, *June 30*, 180–181.

Procedure Resolution, *July 4*, 518, 559, 560.

Navy Estimates—Shipbuilding Resolutions, Financial effect of passing, *June 30*, 214.

Somaliland, Administration of, Present position of Mullah, etc., *July 6*, 788.

Trinity College, Dublin—Administration, Method of Government, Revenue, etc., Return as to, proposed, *July 7*, 975.

Brymbo Water Bill

c. Lords' Amendments, *Con.***July 4*, 438.

Buchanan, Mr. T. R [Perthshire, E.]

Africa, East, Protectorates in—Additional particulars in Estimates, proposed, *July 7*, 957.

Africa, South.

Boers, Repatriation of, Expenditure on—Administration of Loan, Cost of, *July 6*, 787.

Railways, Administration of, Resolutions of Inter-Colonial Council as to, etc., *July 5*, 635.

Army—Mowatt Committee—Summary of Report, etc., Date of presenting to Members, *June 29*, 11–12.

Felixstowe Martello Tower—Sale of Land by Private Negotiation, *July 7*, 954.

Finance Bill, Postponement of, *June 29*, 34.

Holyrood Palace, Condition of, Expenditure on Improvements, etc., *June 30*, 229.

[*cont.*

Buchanan, Mr. T. R.—*cont.*
Navy.
Scouts, Cost and Purposes of, *June 30*, 227.
Shipbuilding Programme for 1904-5, Information as to, *June 30*, 217-218.
Navy Estimates—Shipbuilding Resolutions, Financial effect of passing, etc., *June 30*, 213.
Revenue and Expenditure—Amount of Exchequer Bonds and Treasury Bills outstanding, *July 12*, 1351.
Transvaal.
Finance, Debate on, Tabling Report of Inter-Colonial Council previous to, etc., *July 5*, 639–640.
Legislative Council—Changes in Constitution proposed, *July 5*, 639.

Bulgaria
Removal by Inhabitants to other parts of European Turkey, Cancelling Prohibition against.
Q. Mr. Moon ; *A.* Earl Percy, *June 30*, 144.

Burlington House
Colonnade removed from—Re-erection elsewhere, proposed.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill ; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *July 6*, 773.

Burns, Mr. J. [Battersea]
London County Council (General Powers) Bill, *con.*, *June 29*, 94, 96.
Lord Chancellor, Residence of, Expenditure in connection with Repairs to, *June 30*, 231.
Palaces, Royal, Cost of Maintenance and Repairs of, *June 30*, 230–232.

Burtonport Railway
Agreement for making, Alleged Changes made by Solicitor in—Publishing Correspondence, etc.
Q. Mr. McFadden ; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *July 5*, 630–631.
Gross Earnings per Mile per Week, etc.
Q. Mr. McFadden ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 148–149.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty ; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *June 30*, 175-176.

Business of the House
Course of, *July 5*, 768.
Balfour, Mr. A. J., Replies by, to Questions and Criticisms, *July 4*, 487 ; *July 6*, 807 ; *July 7*, 979, 980 ; *July 11*, 1224 ; *July 12*, 1367, 1368.

Butcher, Mr. J. G. [York.]
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *July 12*, 1406, 1407.

Butter
Ireland—Salt Firkin Butter, Number of Prosecutions for Excessive Moisture, &c.
Qs. Mr. Flavin, Mr. Lundon, Mr. Kilbride, Mr. O'Shaughnessy. *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 13*, 1486, 1487.

Buxton Mr. S. C. [Tower Hamlets, Poplar.]
Finance Bill, Date of Taking, *July 12*, 1367.
Licensing Bill, Position of, on the Order Paper, *July 11*, 1321.
Navy Contractors—Fair Wages Resolution and the Employment of Non-Union Workmen—Case of Messrs. Lysaght, &c., *July 13*, 1475.
Port of London Bill, Opposition to—Discussing Reasons for Discharge, *July 11*, 1223.
Transvaal
Chinese Labour, Importation of
Advertisements in *Chinese Times*, False Impression given by, etc., *June 29*, 12, 13.
Numbers, Total. Imported—Men, Women and Children, *July 4*, 460.
Native Labour in Mines—Statistics for Three Months, *June 30*, 153 ; *July 4*, 456.

Buxton Urban District Council Bill
l. Rep.* *July 4*, 390
3 R.* *July 7*, 918.
c. 1 R.* *July 7*, 943.

Cable Service
Indian Rate—Obtaining Further Reductions.
Q. Sir E. Sassoon ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 30*, 147–148.

Cadogan, Earl
Anderson, Constable, Charges against, and Dismissal from the Force—Tabling Papers relating to, *July 11*, 1148 ; *July 12*, 1342, 1343, 1345.

Caldwell, Mr. J. [Lanarkshire, Mid]
Holyrood Palace, Condition of, Expenditure on Improvements, etc., *June 30*, 229.
St. James's Palace, Wine Cellars at, Expenditure on Improvements, *June 30*, 229.

Caledonian Railway Order Confirmation Bill
l. 2R.* *June 30*, 118.
3R.* *July 1*, 266.
c. 1R.* *July 4*, 442.
2R.* *July 12*, 1346.

Campbell, Mr. John [Armagh, S.]

Fortune-telling, etc., Frauds in connection with—Instructing Police to Prosecute, etc., *July 5*, 643 ; *July 12*, 1357.

Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hon. Sir H. [Stirling Burghs]

Aliens Bill, Abandonment of, *July 7*, 980.

Army Reform Statement, Date of Making, *July 7*, 979 ; *July 13*, 1492, 1493.

Business of the House, Course of, *July 4*, 487, 488 ; *July 6*, 807 ; *July 11*, 1224.

Colonial Office Vote, Date of taking, *July 11*, 1223.

Licensing Bill.

Com., *July 13*, 1495.

Procedure Resolution, *July 4*, 582.

Tibet Expedition, Information as to, *July 6*, 806 ;*July 7*, 955.

Canada

Fenian Raids in 1866, 1868, and 1870, Medals Granted for Services in Repelling.

Q. Mr. Moon ; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 6*, 780.

Canal Rates and Charges (Regents Canal) Order Confirmation Bill

c. 2R.* *July 4*, 439.

Canterbury, Lord Archbishop of

Education (Transferred Schools) Bill, 2R. *July 4*, 410, 417, 419.

Transubstantiation, King's Declaration against—Alteration in form of Oath, proposed, *July 1*, 279, 280, 309.

Cape Colony

Chinese Exclusion Bill, Delay in Assenting to, Reason of.

Qs. Mr. S. MacNeill ; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 4*, 465 ; *July 11*, 1202.

Observatory — Report (1903), Presented, *July 4*, 391, 444.

Cappawhite

Dowling, Thomas, Sale of Estate of—Withdrawal of portion, etc.

Qs. Mr. K. O'Brien ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 964, 965.

Cardiff Railway Bill

c. Rep.* *June 30*, 138.

Carnane Estate

Sale of, proposed—Addition of Name of Owner in order to Identify Estate.

Q. Mr. Lundon ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 962, 963.

Carson, Sir E. H.—*Solicitor-General* [Dublin University]

Licensing Bill, *Com. June 29*, 58, 68-70, 77, 86, 89, 101, 103, 104 ; *July 5*, 729. 746, 754, 760, 765-767 ; *July 6*, 810, 812-814, 829, 836, 838, 853, 855-857, 871, 872, 879, 886 ; *July 11*, 1126, 1260, 1262, 1271, 1273, 1274, 1276 - 1278, 1282, 1284, 1294-1298 ; *July 12*, 1372, 1377, 1387, 1408, 1450, 1456 ; *July 13*, 1494, 1496, 1499, 1500, 1503, 1505, 1508, 1518, 1519, 1532, 1539-1544, 1557, 1562, 1565, 1566, 1570.

Cashel

Labourers' Cottages in District of—Delay in erecting Cottage for W. Carroll.

Q. Mr. Condon ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 11*, 1194-1195.

Castleblayney Union

Labourers' Cottages in—Arbitrator's Award for Land—Alleged interested Decision, etc.

Q. Mr. McKean ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 29*, 24-25.

Cavalry

see under Army.

Cavendish, Mr. V. C. W.—*Financial Secretary to the Treasury* [Derbyshire, W.]

Christ's Hospital Site, Post Office Buildings to be erected on, fixing Rateable Value of, *June 30*, 146.

Civil Service Retirement Regulations, *July 11*, 1187.

Customs Clerks, Junior Assistant—Promotion for Special Checking Work, Alleged, *July 1*, 320.

Ireland.

Arklow Harbour, Condition of, *July 7*, 1023.

Board of Works.

Grants for Harbours, etc., Discontinuance of, *July 7*, 1023.

Loans, Conditions of Granting, Rate of Interest, etc., *July 7*, 1023.

Burtonport Railway—Gross Earnings per Mile per Week, etc., *June 30*, 175-176.

Congested Districts Board—Recruiting Staff from permanent Civil Service Men, *July 5*, 658-659.

Donegal Railway—Through Bookings of Goods to and from Ballybofry, *June 30*, 151.

Grand Canal Company—Dispute as to Tolls, *July 7*, 1024.

Phœnix Park, Dublin.

Traders' Vans, etc., Regulations as to, *July 11*, 1216.

Upkeep of—Removal of Decayed and Fallen Trees, *July 7*, 1024.

[*cont.*

Cavendish, Mr. V. C. W. etc.,—*cont.*
- Ireland—*cont.*
  - Public Departments, Contracts for Supplies for—Advertising in Local Papers, *July 7*, 1023.
  - Queen's College, Belfast—Pavement, Organ, etc., Cost of, *July 13*, 148.
  - Tara, Hill of—Steps taken to Prevent Excavations, *July 7*, 1024.
  - Taxation—Cost of Collection, Details of, *July 5*, 623-624.
- Licensed Premises—Valuation for Probate, Particulars as to, etc., *June 29*, 8.
- Raglan Castle, Abolishing Charges for Photographing, *June 30*, 147.
- Silver Coinage for Crown Colonies, Minting of—Commissions paid to Crown Agents, etc., *June 30*, 146; *July 13*, 1480.
- *Times, The*—Supply of Copies to Government Departments, *June 29*, 5.
- Whisky.
  - Bonded—Official Knowledge of Contents of Casks, etc., *July 13*, 1481.
  - Pot Still and Patent Still Spirit, Separating in Annual Revenue Return, Proposed, *July 13*, 1481.

Cayzer, Sir C. W. [Barrow-in-Furness]
- "Allanton," Seizure of—Reasons for Confiscation of Cargo by Russian Prize Court, *July 7*, 956.

Census
- Africa, British South—Returns Presented, *July 4*, 391, 443.

"Centurion," H.M.S.
- Gun Sights, Defective condition of.
  - *Q.* Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 11*, 1199-1200.

Ceylon
- Crime, Punishment of — Transportation instead of Capital Punishment, proposed.
  - *Q.* Mr. Schwann; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 13*, 1473.

Chairman
- Attacks by Members on Private Individuals, Rule of the House allowing, *July 13*, 1560.
- Deputy.
  - Civil Service Estimates—Introduction of Matter irrevelant to Vote under discussion, *July 7*, 1034, 1035.
- Divisions, Members personally or pecuniarily interested in, Liability of, to have Vote struck off, *July 6*, 903, 905, 910-913; *July 11*, 1305, 1306.
- Irrelevant Matter, Introduction of, *June 29*, 45, 80.

Chairman—*cont.*
- Licensing Bill.
  - Amendments to, Order of taking, *June 29*, 100; *July 11*, 1235.
  - *Boná-fide* Tenancy, Amendment as to, *July 5*, 750-753.
  - Discussion of, after Question put, according to Closure Resolution, 1443, 1444.
  - Interruptions to Debate, *July 12*, 1443.
  - Licence Duties, Proposal to increase—Necessity for Origination of the proposal in Committee of whole House, *July 12*, 1419.
  - Licences, Authority for Refusing, Discussion of, on Amendments, *July 6*, 823.

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. [Birmingham, W.]
- Licensing Bill Procedure Resolution, *July 4*, 563, 565, 570, 575.

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. A.—*Chancellor of the Exchequer* [Worcestershire, E.]
- Alcohol for Manufacturing Purposes.
  - Alteration in present Law proposed, *July 6*, 791.
  - Source of Supply, Extent of German Trade, etc., *July 6*, 790, 791.
- Coal, Export of — Total Quantity above 6s. a Ton exported 1902-3, *June 29*, 8.
- Consolidated Fund — Supply Services, Issues for, Acts Governing, etc., *June 29*, 19-20.
- Customs and Excise—New Taxes, Date of enforcing — Interpretation of Section 18 of Customs Consolidation Act, 1876, *July 7*, 958.
- Expenditure (1903-4), Particulars as to, *July 13*, 1465, 1466.
- Finance Act 1902—Duty Free Spirits—Taking advantage of Section 8, *June 29*, 9.
- Finance Bill.
  - Date of proceeding with, *July 5*, 642.
  - Taxes, proposed new, Enforcement of, *June 29*, 20.
- Income Tax.
  - Abatement for Co-operative Societies, *June 29*, 8.
  - Cotton Growing Association, Assessment for, *July 4*, 448.
- Navy Estimates — Shipbuilding Resolutions, Financial Effect of Passing, etc., *June 30*, 214.
- Spirits.
  - Distillation in England—Total Quantity distilled 1903, etc., *July 5*, 641.
  - Removals from Bond, Revenue derived from Additional Duty on, *July 13*, 1466.

[*cont.*

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. A.—*cont.*
Spirits—*cont.*
Sweets Imported from the Continent containing Spirits, Restricting Sale of, proposed, *July 6*, 789, 790.
Taxation—New Taxes, Date of enforcing—Interpretation of Section 18 of Customs Consolidation Act, 1876, *July 7*, 958.
Tobacco Duty—Budget Proposals.
Modifying Proposals, *July 5*, 641–642.
Strips, Imported, and Strips produced from Imported Leaf, Estimate of Duty on, *July 5*, 627–630.

Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster
Rt. Hon. Sir W. H. Walrond.

Chancellor of the Exchequer
Mr. Austen Chamberlain.

Channing, Mr. F. A. [Northants, E.]
Accidents on Electric Railways—Precautions for Public Safety, *June 29*, 5–6.
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *July 6*, 863 ; *July 12*, 1378.
Taxation, Inquiry into Incidence of, Appointing Select Committee for, *June 29*, 31.

Chantrey Trust Administration
Select Committee,
Appointment of, *July 1*, 313.
Evidence given before—Order as to, *July 7*, 921.

Charing Cross, Euston and Hampstead Railway Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *July 4*, 389.
3R.* *July 11*, 1145.

Charities
Nautical—Number, Administration, etc.—Return, proposed.
Os. Lord Muskerry *July 1*, 267 ; Lord Wolverton, 268.
Parish Charities, Scotland, Granting Return of.
Q. Mr. Haldane ; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *July 11*, 1187–1188.
Whitstable Scheme, Local opposition to, etc.
Qs. Mr. Slack ; *As.* Mr. G. Boscawen, *July 1*, 317 ; *July 6*, 775, 776.
Q. Mr. Slack ; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *July 7*, 950.

Chatham
Military Railway, Reason for Suspension of Work on—Cost of Work done, etc.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill ; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *July 5*, 636–638.

Chertsey
Parliamentary By-election—New Member Sworn, *July 11*, 1224.

Cheshire County Council
Education — Agreements of Teachers — Circular issued by County Council.
Qs. Mr. Boland ; *As.* Sir W. Anson, *July 7*, 960, 961.

Chicago
Trade Report, Presented, *July 5*, 603.

Chief Secretary for Ireland
Mr. G. Wyndham.

Children
Defective and Epileptic- Education Regulations Presented, *July 11*, 1146, 1185.
Employment of.
Scotland—Bye-laws, Number sent in by local authorities for confirmation, etc.
Q. Mr. Tennant ; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *July 6*, 775.
Infants, Mortality among, High Rate of—Issuing Circular as to encouraging Poor People to apply for early Medical Relief, etc.
Q. Sir W. Foster ; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *July 11*, 1192–1193.
Poor Law—Barrack School system—Forest Gate School, Proposed purchase of, by West Ham Board of Guardians, alleged.
Qs. Mr. Lough ; *As.* Mr. G. Lawson, *July 13*, 1481, 1482.

China
Anti-Foreign Rising of 1900–1901—Guns Captured, Allotment of, in Great Britain—Refusal of guns by London County Council, alleged.
Q. Mr. Coghill ; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 7*, 952.
Q. Mr. Whitmore ; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 8*, 1092–1093.
Tibet, *see that title.*
Wei-hai-wei, *see that title.*

Christ's Hospital Site
Post Office Buildings to be Erected on, Fixing Rateable Value of.
Q. Sir J. Dimsdale ; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *June 30*, 146.

Churchill, Mr. W. L. S. [Oldham]
Army, Reform Proposals — Statement, Opportunity for Discussing, *July 13*, 1493.
Divisions, Members Personally or Pecuniarily Interested in—Liability to have Vote struck off, *July 6*, 913.
Licensing Bill Procedure Resolution, *July 4*, 573, 575, 576, 578–580.
Tibet Expedition—Progress of Negotiations, Character of the Expedition, Government Policy, etc., *July 6*, 914.

City of London (Central Criminal Court House) Bill
l. 2R.* *June 30*, 117.
Rep.* *July 7*, 917.
3R.* *July 11*, 1145.

Civil Service
Retirement Regulations.
Q. Mr. Yoxall; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *July 11*, 1187.
Superannuation.
Appointment without Certificate, *July 11*, 1147, 1185; *July 13*, 1459.
Director of Barrack Construction, Minute as to Qualifications of, Presented, *July 6*, 770; *July 7*, 920.

Civil Service Estimates
Ireland.
Land Commission, Salaries and Expenses of—£71,342, *Com.*, *July 7*, 984.
Offices of Chief Secretary in Dublin and London, and of Inspectors of Lunatic Asylums—£14,371, *Com.*, *July 7*, 1026.
Public Works—Salaries and Expenses of Office—£21,773, *Com.*, *July 7*, 1017.
Palaces, Royal—£35,500, *Com.*, *June 30*, 227.
Parks and Pleasure Gardens — £69,100, *Com.*, *June 30*, 232, 263.

Clancy, Mr. J. J. [Dublin Co., N.]
Phœnix Park, Dublin—Regulations as to Traders' Vans, etc., *July 11*, 1216.

Clanricarde Estate, Woodford
Tenants' Right to Shooting, Dispute as to, etc.
Q. Mr. Roche; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 174.
Qs. Mr. Roche, Mr. Kilbride, Mr. T. W. Russell; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, Mr. Speaker, *July 4*, 474–476.
Qs. Mr. Roche, Mr. Kilbride; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 795–797.

Clonbrock, Lord
Registration of Clubs (Ireland) Bill, 2R. *July 12*, 1327.

Clyde Navigation (Works) Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *July 11*, 1145.

Clyde Valley Electrical Power Bill
c. *Con.** *July 4*, 439.
3R.* *July 7*, 942.
l. Commons' Amendments, *Con.** *July 8*, 1049.

Coal
Export of—Total Quantity above 6s. a Ton exported 1902–3.
Q. Mr. C. Douglas; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *June 29*, 8.

Coal—*cont.*
Supply of, to Foreign Warships, Regulations as to.
Os. Mr. G. Bowles, *June 30*, 222; Mr. Pretyman, 226.
Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 11*, 1219–1220.
Trade Reports, Extracts from—Return ordered, *July 6*, 771.

Cochrane, Mr. T. H. — *Under Secretary, Home Office* [Ayrshire, N.]
Aliens—Pauper Lunatics and Convicts, Statistics as to, *July 11*, 1207.
Ankylostomiasis, Notification of, Rendering Compulsory, *July 5*, 643.
Factories and Workshops—Report of Chief Inspector, Cause of Delay in Publishing, *July 11*, 1207.
Fortune-telling, Frauds in connection with—Instructing Police to Prosecute, *July 5*, 644.
Workmen's Compensation for Accidents Act Amendment Bill, Date of Introduction of, *June 29*, 20–21.

Coghill, Mr. D. H. [Stoke-upon-Trent]
Army—Cartridges, Ball and Dummy, Increasing Distinction between, to prevent mistakes in serving out, proposed, *July 7*, 954, 955.
Guns captured in South African War and Chinese Anti-Foreign Rising, Allotment of, in Great Britain—Refusal of Guns by London County Council, alleged, *July 7*, 952.
Irish Land Stock, Method of issuing, *July 7*, 1014.
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *July 13*, 1516.
Militia—Death of William Hill through Ball Cartridge being Served out for practice instead of Dummy Cartridge—Compensation to Relatives, etc., *June 30*, 154; *July 7*, 954, 955.
Questions, Order of, *July 7*, 953.

Cohen, Mr. B. L. [Islington, E.]
Licensing Bill Procedure Resolution, *July 5*, 684.

Coins and Coinage
Silver Coinage for Crown Colonies, Minting of — Commissions Paid to Crown Agents, etc.
Qs. Mr. Bayley; *As.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *June 30*, 146; *July 13*, 1480.

Coleraine
Publican at, Alleged Police Persecution of
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh, Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 169.

Coleridge, Lord
Transvaal, Importation of Chinese Labour to—Wives and Children, Facilities for Introduction of, Number Registered, etc., *July 5*, 616.

Collierstown
Evicted Tenant, Frederick Morres, Reinstatement of.
Q. Mr. Sheehy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 13*, 1488, 1489.

Colomb, Sir J. C. R. [Great Yarmouth]
Artillery, Date of Providing New Guns for, *June 30*, 186.
Brennan Torpedoes, Expenditure on, *June 30*, 196; *July 5*, 633.
Militia—Artillery Corps.
Mobilisation—Estimated Cost of Conveyance from the North to Portsmouth, *July 6*, 778, 779.
Training—Guns and Appliances in use at Local Headquarters, *July 6*, 779.
Navy—"Scout" Class of Boat—Bunker Capacity—Coal Capacity—Maintenance of Speed, *July 5*, 626.
Submarine Mines, Questionable Policy of Placing, under Control of the War Office, *June 30*, 196.
Volunteers—C.I.V.—Conditions of Service in South Africa, *June 30*, 152.

Colonial Office
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. Alfred Lyttelton.
Parliamentary Secretary—Duke of Marlborough.
Vote for, Date of Taking.
Qs. Mr. J. Ellis, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 11*, 1223–1224.
Qs. Mr. J. Ellis, Sir H. Fowler; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 13*, 1490, 1491.

Colonies
Crown Agents for, *see* Crown Agents for the Colonies.
Reports, Annual, presented, *July 8*, 1054, 1089; *July 13*, 1458.

Committees
House of Commons—Public Petitions Committee—Reports presented, *June 29*, 34.

Compton, Lord A. F. [Bedfordshire, Biggleswade]
London Port and Docks Bill, Withdrawal of, *July 11*, 1182.

Compulsory Military Service
"Blue Water School" opposition to.
O. Earl of Wemyss, *July 11*, 1152.
Lyttelton, Gen. Sir N., Speech of.
Os. Earl of Wemyss, *July 11*, 1156, 1178; Lord Newton, 1160; Earl of Donoughmore, 1167, 1168; Earl Spencer, 1173, 1174; Marquess of Lansdowne, 1175.

Compulsory Military Service—*cont.*
Navy, Efficiency of, for defence of the Empire.
O. Earl of Wemyss, *July 11*, 1152, 1153.
Norfolk Commission Report and Recommendations.
Os. Earl of Wemyss, *July 11*, 1150, 1151, 1152, 1154; Lord Newton, 1159–1161; Viscount Hardinge, 1162, 1163.
Public Opinion as to.
Os. Earl of Wemyss, *July 11*, 1154, 1155.

Comyn Kenny Estate, Galway
Tenant Purchasers of—Enlarging Uneconomic Holdings.
Q. Mr. Roche; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 654–655.

Condon, Mr. T. J. [Tipperary, E.]
Cashel Rural District—Delay in erection of Labourer's Cottage for W. Carroll, *July 11*, 1194–1195.

Congested Districts Board, Ireland
Clerkships, Temporary, System of Examinations for, Reason for abolishing.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 657–658.
Fish-curing Stations on West Coast, Conditions of letting.
Q. Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 483.
Kerry, Estates purchased in, prices paid for.
O. Mr. Murphy, *July 7*, 1006.
Kilclooney Property, Price paid for—Price asked by Board for Land to enlarge Burial Ground.
Q. Mr. Roche; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 173.
Listellick Farm, Kerry, Purchase of.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 169.
Number of Estates purchased by.
Os. Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 7*, 993; Mr. Wyndham, 1001.
Rae Estate, Kerry, proposed Purchase of.
Qs. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 174; *July 12*, 1366.
Sligo, Estates Purchased in—Purchase Money—Gross Rentals, etc.
Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 622–624, 656.
Staff of, Recruiting from Permanent Civil Service Men, etc.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *July 5*, 658–659.

Congested Districts, Ireland
Kerry, South, Number of Estates offered for Sale in—Price demanded, etc.
Qs. Mr. Boland, Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 478–479.

Constabulary, Royal Irish

Anderson, Constable—Charges against and Dismissal from the Force.

Discussion of—Arrangement as to, between the Secretary of the Irish Unionist Party, and the Chief Unionist Whip.
Os. Mr. Lonsdale, *July 7*, 1040, 1041; Mr. J. Redmond, 1045–1046; Mr. Wyndham, 1040, 1041, 1046; Sir A. Acland Hood, 1046–1048.

MacDonnell, Sir Antony.

Action of — Grounds for Reinstatement, etc.
Qs. Mr. C. Craig, Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 29*, 29-31.

Insinuations against.
Os. Mr. J. Devlin, *July 7*, 1037; Mr. Wyndham, 1041.

Miscarriage of Justice—Conspiracy on part of Roman Catholics, alleged.
Os. Mr. J. Devlin, *July 7*, 1037, 1038; Mr. C. Craig, Mr. J. Redmond, 1039.

Official Papers and Correspondence relating to—Tabling.
Os. Earl Cadogan, *July 11*, 1148; *July 12*, 1342, 1343, 1345; Lord Ashbourne, 1343–1345; Earl Spencer, Marquess of Lansdowne, 1344, 1345.
Qs. Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 13*, 1485, 1486.

Ballinagore, Protection of Herd at.
Q. Mr. Sullivan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 148.

Ballingeary, Force at — Abolishing Barracks.
Q. Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 166.

Belfast, Appointments in — Preference given to Roman Catholics, alleged.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 777.

Greencastle Force, reinstating Sergeant Gallagher in charge of.
Qs. Mr. J. Devlin, Mr. Sloan, Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 653–654.

Millstreet Barracks — Lodging-out Allowances — Abolishing Station as District Headquarters, etc.
Q. Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 29*, 24-25, 26.

Names of Constables occupying Barracks, etc.
Qs. Mr. Sheehan; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 971.

Molloy, Constable, Conduct of, at Coleraine Petty Sessions—Date of Reporting, to Inspector General.
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 652; *July 7*, 966.

Constabulary, Royal Irish—*cont.*

Moy District—House to House Inquiries by Police, alleged.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 951, 952.

Naughten, Martin, Arrest of, Examination of Arresting Constable.
Q. Mr. O' Malley; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 151.

Punishment of — Number Punished at Instance of Country Inspector Ball.
Q. Mr. P. M'Hugh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 12*, 1351.

Roundstone—Flags Displayed on Licensed Premises prohibited by Constables, alleged.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 778.

Ryan, Constable, Reasons for Promotion of,
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 776, 777.

Tallow, Extra Police requisitioned for one day—Reason, payment of Expense, etc.
Q. Mr. O'Shee; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 969.

Constabulary, South African

See under Africa, South.

Constantinople

Post Office Savings Banks Regulations presented, *June 30*, 142; *July 1*, 266.

Continental Free Ports

Particulars as to—Return ordered, *June 30*, 142.

Contracts

Army—Ballykinlor Camp Meat Tender—Reason for not accepting lowest Tender.
Q. Mr. Wood; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 11*, 1198.

Public Departments, Ireland—Advertising Contracts for Supplies in Local Papers.
Os. Sir T. Esmonde, *July 7*, 1019; Mr. V. Cavendish, 1023.

Convicts

Aliens confined in Convict Prisons, Number of, etc.
Q. Sir W. Greene; *A.* Mr. Cochrane, *July* 11, 1207.

Corbett, Mr. A. C. [Glasgow, Tradeston]

Licensed Premises—Valuation for Probate, Particulars as to, etc., *June 29*, 7–8.

Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 71; *July 12*, 1392.

Corbett, Mr. T. L. [Down, N.]

Bangor, Provisions of Harbour, Question of Grant, etc., *July 7*, 1024.

Cork

Children's Court, Establishment of.
Q. Mr. H. Law; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 962.

English Cemetery, Site of—Reason for exchange, Present use of Site, etc.
Q. Sir H. Fowler; *A.* Earl Percy, *July 8*, 1089.

Post Office.

Punishments, Disparity in, alleged.
Qs. Mr. J. F. X. O'Brien; *As.* Lord Stanley, *July 7*, 973, 974.

Tracts, Distribution of, by Commander Salwey—Stopping Practice.
Qs. Mr. J. F. X. O'Brien; *As.* Lord Stanley, *June 30*, 176-177.

Queen's College.

Number of Candidates passing B.A. Examinations at Royal University (1899-1903).
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 13*, 1460-1462, 1482.

Session, Duration of.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 12*, 1363.

Coronation Oath

Transubstantiation, King's declaration against, *see that title.*

Cotton Industry

Factories of Cotton Cloth, Ventilation of—Report Presented, *June 29*, 4; *June 30*, 119.

Income Tax Assessment on Contributions to British Cotton-growing Association.
Q. Mr. Emmott; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *July 4*, 448.

County Boroughs

Number with Population below 50,000.
Q. Sir E. Sassoon; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *June 30*, 145.

County Councils

Ireland—Harbour Authorities, Transfer of Powers from, introducing Bill for.
Q. Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 11*, 1210.

County Courts

England and Wales—Plaints, Number of, in 1903—Return Ordered, *June 30*, 142; Presented, *July 11*, 1184.

Ireland—Receipts and Expenditure (1903-4)—Accounts Presented, *June 29*, 4; *June 30*, 120.

County Courts Bill

l. 1R.* *July 7*, 921.

County of Suffolk Bill

c. 2R.* *July 7*, 1048.

Cowper, Earl

Transubstantiation, King's Declaration against—Alteration in form of Oath proposed, *July 1*, 282.

Craig, Mr. C. C. [Antrim, S.]

Ballinasloe Lunatic Asylum—Appointment of Dr. Kirwan as Medical Superintendent, *July 7*, 1039, 1040.

Belfast Mails.

London Mails, Delay in Delivery of, *July 4*, 486.

Supplementary Mail Service to England leaving at 6.45 p.m., Authorising, *July 4*, 485-486.

Constabulary — Constable Anderson, Charges against, and Dismissal from the Force, *July 7*, 1039.

MacDonnell, Sir A., Action of, *June 29*, 29.

Labourers (Ireland) Bill—Motion to commit to Standing Committee on Trade, *July 8*, 1099.

Mayo Harbour Works, Government Advances for, etc., *July 4*, 479.

Crean, Mr. E. [Cork, S.E.]

Kinsale, Proselytising Practices of Commander Salwey R.N. at—Removal from Kinsale District, *July 11*, 1215.

Cremer, Mr. W. R. [Shoreditch, Haggerston]

Transvaal, Importation of Chinese Labour to—Escape and Capture of two Coolies, alleged, *July 11*, 1324.

Crewe, Earl of

Transubstantiation, King's Declaration against—Alteration in Form of Oath, proposed, *July 1*, 293, 308.

Criminal Aliens Bill

c. 1R.* *July 12*, 1369.

Criminal and Judicial Statistics

Ireland (1903)—Civil Statistics, Presented, *July 8*, 1054, 1088.

Criminals

Ireland—Finger-prints, Regulations for taking, Presented, *July 12*, 1326, 1348.

Cripps, Mr. C. A. [Lancashire, Stretford]

Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *July 6*, 823, 824, 854; *July 11*, 1254, 1256; *July 12*, 1419, 1442; *July 13*, 1542, 1543.

Cromer

Post Office, Letters Addressed to, Charge for.
Q. Mr. Broadhurst; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 7*, 949.

Crooks, Mr. W. [Woolwich]

Licensing Bill.

Com., *July 11*, 1286, 1300.

Procedure Resolution, *July 1*, 382, 383; *July 5*, 719, 722.

[*cont.*

Crooks, Mr. W.—*cont.*
London County Council (General Powers) Bill, *con.*, June 29, 95.
Thames Barrage Scheme and National Foreshore Reclamation, Appointing Departmental Committee to Consider, *July 11*, 1219.
Unemployed, Dealing with Question of, during Recess, *July 11*, 1218.

Cross, Mr. A. [Glasgow, Camlachie]
Paupers, Increase of, in Scotland, Inquiry as to Cause of, proposed, *July 13*, 1461.

Crown Agents for the Colonies
Africa, South, Goods Shipped to, during past Six Months, Arrangements as to, Names of Firms Employed and Freights Paid, etc.
Os. Earl of Portsmouth, *July 12*, 1330; Duke of Marlborough, 1336, 1337.
Agent as Director of the London Assurance Company — Breach of Civil Service Regulations.
Os. Earl of Portsmouth, *July 12*, 1329, 1330; Duke of Marlborough, 1331, 1332.
Coinage Minted for the Colonies—Commission Paid to Agents.
Qs. Mr. Bayley, Mr. Markham; *As.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *July 13*, 1480.

Crystal Palace District Gas Bill.
l. 3R.* *June 30*, 117.
c. Lords' Amendments., *con.** *July 7*, 942.

Cullinan, Mr. J. [Tipperary, S.]
Evicted Tenants, Delay in Re-instatement of, *July 7*, 986.
Land Act of 1903, Working of, *July 7*, 984, 985.
Land Commissioners, Unsatisfactory Work of, *July 7*, 985.
Land Judge's Court, Increased Prices of Land in, Reasons for, *July 7*, 986.
Post Office—Sub-postmasters, Remuneration of, in Ireland, *July 1*, 319.
Westropp Estate, Action of Land Judge in Delaying Sale of, *July 7*, 986.

Cunard Agreement
Date of Taking.
Os. Mr. G. Bowles; Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 6*, 807.

Curzon, Lord
Committee of Defence, Participation in Proceedings of.
Qs. Mr. S. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 6*, 805.

Cust, Mr. H. J. C. [Southwark, Bermondsey]
Licensing Bill Procedure Resolution, *July 1*, 369.

Customs and Excise
Clerks, Junior Assistant, Promotion of, for Special Checking Work, alleged.
Q. Mr. C. Hay; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *July 1*, 319, 320.
Finance Act, 1902, Section 8, Taking Advantage of.
Q. Mr. L. Sinclair; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *June 29*, 8–9.
New Taxes, Date of Enforcement by Collecting Departments — Interpretation of Section 18 of Customs Consolidation Act, 1876.
Qs. Mr. E. Robertson, Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *July 7*, 957, 958, 959.
Removals from Bond, Revenue Derived from Additional Duty on.
Q. Mr. Lough; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *July 13*, 1466.

Dalziel, Mr. J. H. [Kirkcaldy Burghs]
Divisions, Members personally or pecuniarily Interested in—Liability to have Vote struck off, *July 6*, 911.
Licensing Bill Procedure Resolution, *July 5*, 670.
Tibet Expedition—Progress of Negotiations, Character of the Expedition, Government Policy, etc., *July 6*, 913.

Davenport, Mr. W. B.—*Financial Secretary to the War Office* [Cheshire, Macclesfield]
Cartridges, Ball and Dummy, Increasing Distinction between, to Prevent Mistakes in Serving Out, proposed, *July 7*, 954, 955.
Chatham Military Railway—Reason for Suspension of Work—Cost of Work done, *July 5*, 637–638.
Clothing Factory—Pressing Rooms, Improving Ventilation of, *June 29*, 10–11.
Contracts—Fair Wages Resolution and the Employment of Union or Non-union Workmen—Case of Messrs. Lysaght, *July 6*, 782, 783; *July 13*, 1475.
Felixstowe Martello Tower—Sale of Land by Private Negotiation, *July 7*, 954.
Guns.
  Allocation of Orders for, Proportion Given to the Trade, etc., *June 30*, 190.
  Expenditure on New, Placing Bulk of, on the Estimates for 1907, alleged, *June 30*, 189.
  Machine—Number in Use, Number Ordered, Cost, etc., *July 6*, 782.
  Quick-firing, Alleged Delay in Provision of, *June 30*, 188.
Hill, Private William, Death of, Through Ball Cartridge being Served Out instead of Dummy, for Practice—Compensation to Relatives, etc., *July 7*, 954, 955.

[*con*

Davenport, Mr. W. B.—*cont.*
- Horses—Epizootic Lymphangitis, Introduction of, from South Africa, *July 13*, 1476.
- Longford Infirmary — Refusal to take Urgent Military Cases during Closure of Military Hospital, *July 11*, 1218.
- Mountmellick—Closure of the "Cut" by Military Authorities—Allowing Removal of Peat, *July 11*, 1217.
- Mowatt Committee—Summary of Report etc., Date of Presenting to Members, *June 29*, 12.
- Remount Depôt, Purchase of Land at Bitterne for, *July 5*, 638.
- Rifles.
  - Cost, Relative, of Manufacture by the Government and the Trade, etc., *June 30*, 205, 206.
  - New Pattern, Shooting Experiments with—comparison with old Rifle, etc., *June 30*, 205.
- Volunteers, Retired—Number Efficient for not less than three years, *July 6*, 784.
- Yeomanry—South African Clasps, Cause of Delay in Issue of, *July 5*, 624.

Davis, Mr. A. [Carmarthen Boroughs]
- "Passive Resisters," Course of Action to be taken as to, *July 6*, 805.

De Morley Barony
- Claimant to, erroneously stated to be a Peer of the Realm by the Judge of the City of London Court.
  - *Os.* Lord Hawkesbury, Earl of Halsbury, *July 8*, 1083.

De Trafford Estate Bill
- *l.* 3R.* *July 1*, 265.
- *c.* 1R.* *July 4*, 442.
  - 2R.* *July 13*, 1457.

Dean Forest Bill
- *c.* Report from Select Committee, *June 29*, 34.
  - *Com.** and 3R.* *July 1*, 388.
- *l.* 1R.* *July 4*, 389.

Defective and Epileptic Children
- Education—Regulations presented, *July 11*, 1146, 1185.

Defence of the Empire
- Committee of Defence, participation of Lord Curzon in proceedings of.
  - *Qs.* Mr. S. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 6*, 805.
- Compulsory Military Service, *see that title.*

Delany, Mr. W. [Queen's County, Ossory]
- Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department—Veterinary Branch—Position of Roman Catholic Clerks, &c., *July 6*, 801, 802.
- Ballymacrossin Estate, Sale of—Reinstatement of Evicted Tenant, *July* 7, 963, 964.

Delany, Mr. W.—*cont.*
- Evicted Tenants, delay in re-instatemen of, *July 7*, 1008, 1009.
- Land Act of 1903, Working of, *July* 1007.
- Land Estates Commission Inspectors — Number, Religious Denominations, etc *July 13*, 1484.
- Maryborough, Confiscation of Gun of Mr P. Dowling at, etc., *July 5*, 654.
- Mountmellick — Closure of the Cut b Military Authorities — Allowing Re moval of Peat, *July 11*, 1217.

Denbigh, Earl of
- Registration of Clubs (Ireland) Bill, 2R. *July 12*, 1329.

Denny, Col. J. M. [Kilmarnock Burghs]
- "Allanton," s.s. — Confiscation of, b Russians—Proposed Government Ac tion, *July 4*, 445.

Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electri Power Bill
- *l.* Commons' Amendts., *Con.** *July 1*, 26

Dernageas Farm, Longford
- Purchase of, Suggested, for enlarging sma Holdings.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* M Wyndham, *June 29*, 21–22.

Derry
- *see* Londonderry.

Derrygoolan
- Tenants' Right to Shooting—Police Interference, etc.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Kilbride, Mr. Flavin; *A* Mr. Wyndham, *July 11*, 1211–1212.

Derwent Valley Water Board Bill
- *c.* Rep.* *July 1*, 315.

Development Grant (Ireland) Bill
- Petty Sessions Clerks Fund, transferring Credit Balance to Treasury, Reconsidering Clause as to.
  - *Q.* Mr. O'Shee; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 650.

Devlin, Mr. J. [Kilkenny, N.]
- Agricultural Department — Veterinary Branch—Clerks, Salaries of—Pensions and Increments — Roman Catholic Clerks, *June 30*, 170.
- "Allanton," s.s.—Seizure of, by Russians —Proposed Government Action, *July 4*, 467; *July 7*, 956.
- Anderson, Constable, Charges against, and dismissal from the Force—Correspondence relating to, furnishing copies of, *July 13*, 1485, 1486.
- Ballinasloe Asylum, Appointment of Dr. Kirwan as Medical Superintendent of, *July 7*, 1035.

[*cont.*

Devlin, Mr. J.—*cont.*
- Bangor, Ireland—Improvement in Post Office proposed, *July 13*, 1489.
- Belfast.
  - Dee Street, Insanitary Condition of, *July 4*, 484.
  - Infectious Diseases, Outbreak of.
    - Refuse on Building ground, Prohibition of disposal of, proposed, *July 6*, 797.
    - Smallpox Outbreak—Negligence of City Council — Bringing Pressure to bear on Council, etc., *June 29*, 28.
- Clerks of the Peace of Antrim and Belfast, Amalgamating Offices of — Saving effected, etc., *July 5*, 651–652.
- Constabulary-Constable Anderson, Charges against, and dismissal from the Force, *July 7*, 1037, 1038.
  - Previous Record of Anderson, etc., *June 29*, 30.
- Education—Intermediate Schools, Visits of Messrs. Dale and Stevens to—Reason for Dr. Starkie's Presence, *July 11*, 1210–1211.
- Greencastle Police Force, reinstating Sergeant Gallagher in Charge of, *July 5*, 653.
- Land Estates Commissioners Inspectors—number, religious denominations, etc., *July 13*, 1483.
- Larne Urban District Council, Application from, for increase in number of Councillors, *July 6*, 797.
- Liquor Licensing, etc.—Fees Charged at Antrim and Belfast for Renewal of Licences, *June 30*, 164–165.
- Leagh, Lough, Land Proprietors' Meeting in District of—Election of Trustees for Drainage Works, *July 4*, 481–482.
- Magherafelt — Salters Company Trust, Administration of, *July 13*, 1488.
  - Local Inquiry, Holding, *July 11*, 1214–1215.
- Palmer's Estate, Mayo, Purchase of, *July 4*, 477.

Devonport
- Dockyard, *see under* Dockyards, Naval.
- German Naval Officers, Visit of, photographs taken of fortifications, etc., alleged.
  - *Q.* Mr. Scott Montagu ; *A.* Mr. A. Lee, *July 13*, 1465.

Dewar, Sir T. R. [Tower Hamlets, St. George's]
- Accidents with Covered Vans—Comparison of Figures, May, 1903 and 1904 — Infringement of New Bye-law, *July 4*, 447.
- Lottery Circulars, Foreign — Preventing Postage in Great Britain, *July 4*, 468.
- Workmen's Compensation Act Amendment Bill, Trades affected by, *July 4*, 470.

Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir C. W. [Gloucestershire Forest of Dean]
- Africa, South—Constabulary.
  - Cost of, Transvaal Contribution, &c., *July 6*, 784.
  - Strength of, *June 29*, 17.
- Army.
  - Artillery.
    - Re-armament of.
      - Cost, Date of Completion, etc., Information as to, *June 30*, 155, 187.
      - Guns, Number of, to be completed in the next Financial Year, etc., *June 30*, 155.
  - Clothing Factory — Ventilation of Pressing Rooms, *June 29*, 10–11.
  - Contracts — Fair Wages Resolution and the Employment of Union or Non-Union Workmen—Case of Messrs. Lysaght, *July 6*, 783.
  - Re-armament of, Date of, and Proposed Expenditure on, *June 30*, 182.
- Factories and Workshops — Report of Chief Inspector, Cause of Delay in Publishing, *July 11*, 1206–1207.
- Licensing Bill procedure Resolution, *July 1*, 343, 344 ; *July 5*, 709.
- Navy.
  - Boilers.
    - Coal Consumption per h.p., *July 6*, 775.
    - Committee of Enquiry, Date of Publishing Report of, *June 30*, 221 ; *July 6*, 774.
  - Contracts.
    - Fair Wages Resolution and the Employment of Union or Non-Union Workmen, *July 6*, 781.
  - Wei-hai-wei, Expenditure on—Provision of Coaling Accommodation, etc., *June 30*, 218, 219.
- Russo-Japanese War — British Mail Steamers, Stoppage of, by Russian Warships—Making Inquiry, *July 11*, 1204–1205.
- Transvaal—Native Affairs, Administration of—Reduction in number of Native Commissioners, etc., *July 13*, 1477.
- Yeomanry—South African Clasps, Cause of Delay in Issue of, *July 5*, 624.

Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir J. C. [London]
- Christ's Hospital Site, Post Office Buildings to be erected on, fixing Rateable Value of, *June 30*, 146.

Dingle
- Holding of Thomas O'Donnell, Valuation Error in—Refunding Money, proposed.
  - *Q.* Mr. T. O'Donnell ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 970, 971.

Diseases of Animals
Horses—Epizootic Lymphangitis, Introduction of, from South Africa, Method employed to eradicate Disease, etc.
Q. Mr. H. Fisher ; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 8*, 1093.
Q. Mr. C. Hobhouse ; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *July 13*, 1476.

Tuberculosis—Model Bye-laws, Number of Local Authorities adopting, Means of enforcing adoption, &c.
Q. Mr. Lundon ; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *July 12*, 1358, 1359.

Disraeli, Mr. C. R. [Cheshire, Altrincham]
Hyde Park, Motor Cars in—Speed Regulations, *June 30*, 264.

Licensing Bill.
Com., *June 29*, 42, 57 ; *July 6*, 838 ; *July 12*, 1428 ; *July 13*, 1537, 1568.

Procedure Resolution, *July 1*, 355, 356.

Divisions
Members Personally or Pecuniarily interested in—Liability to have vote struck off.
Os. Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 6*, 903, 909. 910 ; Mr. S. MacNeill, 903 ; Mr. J. W. Lowther, 903, 905, 910–913 ; Mr. Dalziel, Mr. T. Shaw, Mr. Emmott, 911 ; Mr. Whittaker, Mr. Moulton, 912 ; Mr. W. Churchill, 913 ; Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 11*, 1303, 1306 ; Mr. J. W. Lowther, 1305–1306.

Dockyards
Dover—Limits of Dockyard Port, Order Defining, presented, *June 30*, 120, 141.

Dockyards, Naval
Devonport.
Discharges in, Reasons for.
Os. Mr. Kearley, *June* 30, 216.

German Naval Officers, Visit of, Photographs taken of Dockyard, &c., alleged.
Q. Mr. Scott-Montagu ; *A.* Mr. A. Lee, *July 13*, 1465.

Police at, granting rent aid to.
Os. Mr. Kearley, *June 30*, 216 ; Mr. A. Douglas, 217.

Doncaster Corporation Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *July 1*, 265.
3R.* *July 7*, 918.
c. Lords' Amendments, *Con.** *July 12*, 1346.

Donegal
Crimelessness of—Revoking Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act 1881.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 149.

Donegal—*cont.*
Homespuns, Sale of Inferior materials as, alleged.
Q. Mr. H. Law ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 13*, 1487, 1488.

Marine Works Act, Allocation of Money under.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 632–633.

Railway—Through Bookings of Goods to and from Ballybofry.
Q. Mr. McFadden ; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *June 30*, 150–151.

Donelan, Captain A. J. C. [Cork, E.]
Agricultural Department—Promotion of Winter Dairying, *July 4*, 473.

Irish Language, Teaching of, in National Schools—Payments for instruction, *July 13*, 1485.

Land (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 8*, 1112.

Sherlock Estate, Cork—Affording Opportunity for Tenants to purchase Holdings, *July 11*, 1195.

Donoughmore, Earl of—*Under Secretary for War.*
Compulsory Military Service—Recommendations of Norfolk Commission, etc., *July 11*, 1166–1169.

Militia Ballot System, Revival of, proposed, *July 11*, 1169–1172.

Staff Appointments, Increase in number of—Seconding of Officers, term of appointments, etc., *July 8*, 1064–1069.

Yeomanry.
Arming of, Provision of steel weapon' etc., *July 5*, 611.

Position of, as a mounted force, *July 5*, 611.

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. A. [Kent, St. Augustine's.]
Accidents.
Cook, Messrs., at Works of—Fencing Machinery, *June 30*, 143.

Covered Vans, with—Comparison of Figures for May, 1903 and 1904—Infringement of New Bye-law, *July 4*, 447.

Animals in Mines, Cruelty to—Number of prosecutions, etc., *July 7*, 948.

Borstal Prison—Attacks on Warders—Conduct of prison, etc., *July 13*, 1479, 1480.

County Boroughs with Population below 50,000, Number of, *June 30*, 145.

Devonport Dockyard, Granting rent aid to police stationed at, *June 30*, 217.

Electricity in Mines—Recommendations of Committee, *July 7*, 945, 946.

Fortune-tellers, Number of prosecutions of, *July 12*, 1357.

[*cont.*

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. A.—*cont.*
Licensing Bill.
Borough Recorders, Omission of clause as to, *July 7*, 959.
Com., *June 29*, 54, 100; *July 5*, 735, 739, 740; *July 6*, 821, 844; *July 11*, 1267; *July 12*, 1369, 1372, 1375, 1415, 1444, 1452; *July 13*, 1540, 1558.
Licensed Premises involved, Value of, etc., *June 30*, 163; *July 4*, 448, 469–470.
Medical Services requisitioned by the Police, Fees paid for, *July 5*, 625–626.
Motor Accidents, Number of, in comparison with those due to horses and horse-drawn vehicles, *July 6*, 772.
Workmen's Compensation Act Amendment Bill, Trades affected by, *July 4*, 470.

Douglas, Mr. C. M. [Lanark, N.W.]
Coal, Export of—Total Quantity above 6*s*. a ton exported, 1902–3, *June 29*, 8.
Licensing Bill Procedure Resolution, *July 5*, 681, 682, 700.

Dover
Dockyard Port, Limits of, Order defining, presented, *June 30*, 120, 141.

Dowling, Thomas, Estate of
Sale of—Terms of Sale, Withdrawal of Village of Cappawhite, etc.
Qs. Mr. K. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 964, 965.

Down County
Principal Teacher of—Claim to Increment of Salary.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 450–451.

Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Provisional Order Bill
l. 2R.* *July 8*, 1050.
*Com.** *July 12*, 1325.

Drunkenness (Ireland) Bill
c. 1R.* *June 30*, 181.

Dublin
Children's Court, Establishment of.
Q. Mr. H. Law; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 962.
Harcourt Street Postmaster, Salary of.
Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 11*, 1216–1217.
Patterson, Rev. R. D., Annoyance of, in Public Streets, etc.—Police Protection.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 482–483.
Phœnix Park.
National Games, Exclusion of—Preference given to Polo and Cricket.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 172–173.

Dublin—*cont.*
Phœnix Park—*cont.*
Traders' Vans, etc., Regulations as to.
Q. Mr. Clancy; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *July 11*, 1216.
Up-keep of—Removal of Fallen and Decayed Trees.
Os. Sir T. Esmonde, *July 7*, 1018; Mr. V. Cavendish, 1024.
Probates, Delay in Granting, Alleged.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *July 7*, 961.
Trinity College—Administration, Method of Government, Revenue, etc.—Return proposed.
Qs. Mr. S. MacNeill, Mr. Bryce; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 7*, 974–977.

Duke, Mr. H. E. [Plymouth]
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *July 6*, 855, 856, 869, 870, 872; *July 12*, 1427.

Dumbartonshire (Vale of Leven) Water Order Confirmation Bill
l. 1R.* and 2R.* *July 7*, 918, 919.

Dundee, Broughty Ferry and District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill
l. 3R.* *June 30*, 118.

Dunfermline District Water Order Confirmation Bill
c. 2R.* *July 6*, 769.
*Con.** *July 8*, 1085.
3R.* *July 11*, 1182.
l. 1R.* and 2R.* *July 12*, 1325.

Ebbw Vale Urban District Water Bill
c. Rep.* *July 1*, 315.
*Con.** *July 8*, 1085.

Ecclesiastical Causes
Registrar Order in Council Appointing, Presented *June 30*, 120, 141.

Education, Board of
President—Marquess of Londonderry.
Parliamentary Secretary — Sir W. R. Anson.
Defective and Epileptic Children—Regulations Presented, *July 11*, 1146, 1185.
Examinations.
Religious Knowledge — Local Authority, Permission of to be Obtained, to Suspend School Work.
Q. Mr. Soames; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *July 12*, 1349–50.
Training College Students—Regulations Presented, *June 29*, 5; *June 30*, 119.

Education, Board of—*cont.*
- Grants, Change in System of, as announced in Article 31 of Code for 1904—Loss Entailed on Local Education Authorities, etc.
  - *Os.* Earl Bathurst, *July 12*, 1339; Marquess of Londonderry, 1340-1342.
  - *Qs.* Dr. Macnamara; *As.* Sir W. Anson, *July 6*, 792.
- Hygiene, Instruction in, proposed.
  - *Q.* Sir J. Leng; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *July 11*, 1188; *Q.* Sir J. Leng; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *July 11*, 1190, 1191.
  - *Q.* Dr. Thompson; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *July 13*, 1463, 1464.
- Ireland.
  - Intermediate Education.
    - Commission of Inquiry, Constitution, Terms of Reference, etc.
      - *Qs.* Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 12*, 1361, 1362.
    - Inspection, Establishing System of, proposed.
      - *Q.* Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 649-650.
    - Rules Presented, *July 4*, 392, 444.
    - Visits of Messrs. Dale and Stevens to Schools—Reason for Dr. Starkie's Presence.
      - *Q.* Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 11*, 1210-1211.
  - Irish Language, Payments for.
    - *Q.* Capt. Donelan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 13*, 1485.
  - Keelnabrach School, Dangerous Condition of, Alleged Delay in Building New School, etc.
    - *Q.* Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 13*, 1484, 1485.
  - Knocknagin, Delay in Erecting School at.
    - *Q.* Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 7*, 951.
  - Lettir (Kerry) School—Delay in Producing New Plans, alleged.
    - *Q.* Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 1484.
  - Schoolhouse Plans and Estimates, Delay in Sanctioning, Alleged.
    - *Q.* Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 965, 966.
  - Teachers, *see title* National School Teachers.
  - Technical Instruction Act, Granting Return of Officials Employed under.
    - *Q.* Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 648.

Education, Board of—*cont.*
- Ireland—*cont.*
  - University Education, Granting Return as to.
    - *Q.* Mr. Macveagh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 480-481.
  - Woodwork Instruction, Training Teachers for—Object of Course, etc.
    - *Q.* Mr. J. F. X. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 29*, 23-24.
- Religious Instruction.
  - Examinations—Permission of Local Authority to be Obtained before Suspending School Work.
    - *Q.* Mr. Soames; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *July 12*, 1349-50.
  - Non-provided Schools, in, Communicating Regulations as to.
    - *Q.* Mr. H. C. Richards; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *July 5*, 625.
- Schools.
  - Elementary.
    - Grants, New Regulations as to—Hardship to Country Schools, alleged.
      - *Qs.* Dr. Macnamara; *As.* Sir W. Anson, *July 6*, 792.
    - Minute Modifying Regulations, Presented, *July 7*, 920, 943.
  - Endowments—Surplus Amounts, Application of.
    - *Q.* Lord E. Fitzmaurice; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *July 13*, 1464.
    - Keelnabrach School, Dangerous Condition of, Alleged Delay in Building New School, etc.
      - *Q.* Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 13*, 1484, 1485.
    - Knocknagin, Delay in Erection at.
      - *Q.* Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 7*, 951.
    - Lettir (Kerry)—Delay in Producing New Plans, alleged.
      - *Q.* Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 1484.
    - Schoolhouse Plans and Estimates in Ireland, Delay in Sanctioning, alleged.
      - *Q.* Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 965, 966.
- Scotch System, Introduction of, in England and Wales, proposed.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Mansfield, Dr. Macnamara, Mr. Bryce; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 13*, 1491, 1492.
- Scotland.
  - Funds.
    - Allocation of, for Technical Education—Return Ordered, *June 29*, 5.
    - Average Assessment Levied under Act of 1872, etc.—Return Presented, *July 4*, 391, 444.

[*cont.*

Education, Board of—*cont.*
Scotland—*cont.*
Hygiene, Teaching of.
Q. Sir J. Leng; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *July 11*, 1188.
Q. Sir J. Leng; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *July 11*, 1190–1191.
Secondary and Technical.
Allocation of Funds for Technical Education in Scotland—Return Ordered, *June 29*, 5.
Return of Officials employed in Ireland, Granting.
Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 648.
Woodwork Instruction in Ireland, Training Teachers for—Object of Course, etc.
Q. Mr. J. F. X. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 29*, 23–24.
Teachers.
Cheshire County Council and Non-provided School Teachers' Agreements.
Qs. Mr. Boland; *As.* Sir W. Anson, *July 7*, 960, 961.
Pupil.
Act of 1902, Benefits Conferred by
O. Marquess of Londonderry; *July 7*, 933.
Local Authorities, Duties of, as to Training, Removed by the Act of 1902.
Os. Lord Stanley of Alderley, *July 7*, 940; Earl Spencer, 941.
Preliminary Education of — Increase in Grants for.
Os. Marquess of Londonderry, *July 7*, 934; Lord Stanley of Alderley, 939.
Recruiting from Elementary Schools, Advantages of the System.
Os. Lord Stanley of Alderley, *July 7*, 939, 940.
Supply of, Shortage in.
Os. Lord Stanley of Alderley, *July 7*, 937, 938; Earl Spencer, 942.
Training of.
Rate for—Burden on Agriculturists, etc.
Os. Lord Herries, *July 7*, 931; Lord Heneage, 936, 937.
Regulations Presented, *July 6*, 770; *July 7*, 920.
Increased Expenditure involved by.
Os. Lord Herries, *July 7*, 930, 931; Marquess of Londonderry, 932.

Education, Board of—*cont.*
Teachers—*cont.*
Pupil—*cont.*
Travelling Expenses of Teachers Attending Centres in Agricultural Districts, Special Grants for, proposed.
Os. Lord Herries, *July 7*, 930; Marquess of Londonderry, 935; Lord Heneage, 936.
Training of—Regulations Presented, *June 29*, 5; *June 30*, 119.
Training Colleges—Examination of Students—Regulations Presented, *June 29*, 5; *June 30*, 119.

Education Acts, 1902, 1903
Rates, Refusal to Pay — Grievances of "Passive Resisters," Course of Action to be taken as to.
Qs. Mr. A. Davies; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 6*, 805, 806.

Education Board Provisional Order (Birmingham) Bill
c. Rep.* *July 1*, 315.
3R.* *July 4*, 439.

Education Board Provisional Order (Cardiff) Bill
l. 1R.* *June 30*, 119.
2R.* *July 7*, 919.
Rep.* *July 8*, 1050.
3R.* *July 11*, 1146.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill
l. Commons' Amendts., *con.** *July 1*, 266.

Education Department, Scotland
Vice-President of the Council—Mr. A. Graham Murray.
Secretary—Sir Henry Craik.

Education (Scotland) Bill
Date of taking.
Q. Sir J. Stirling-Maxwell; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 29*, 10.

Education (Transferred Schools) Bill
l. 2R. *July 4*, 393.
Debate on 2nd reading (Lords), *July 4*, 393.
Introduction of Bill by Government instead of Private Member, 429, 432, 433.
Religious Instruction.
Denominational Teaching given in or out of School Hours, 395, 409, 411, 416, 421, 435.
Efficiency of Teachers, Objections to Testing, 395, 396, 407, 411, 420, 434.
Local Authorities, Powers of—Freedom of Contract, proposed, 393, 401, 407, 412, 418, 425, 428, 432, 433.

Education (Transferred Schools) Bill—*cont.*
Debate—cont.
Religious Instruction—*cont.*
Nonconformist Opinion, 397, 412, 436
Parental Right to Decide, 395, 402, 416.
Scottish System, Extension of, to England and Wales, proposed, 402, 403, 405, 414, 417, 433.
Undenominational Teaching, Desirability of, 396, 408, 413, 418, 435.

Edwards, Mr. F. [Radnor]
Licensing Bill, *Com. June 29*, 76 ; *July 11*, 1279.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *July 1*, 265.
Com. July 4*, 390.
Rep.* *July 5*, 602.
3R.* *July 7*, 919.
c. 1R.* *July 8*, 1087.
Nature of Proposals—Memorandium Ordered, *July 13*, 1460.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill
l. Report from Select Committee *July 1*, 265.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *July 4*, 390.
Com. July 5*, 602.
Rep.* *July 7*, 919.
3R.* *July 8*, 1050.
c. 1R.* *July 8*, 1087.
Nature of Proposals — Memorandum ordered, *July* 13, 1460.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill
c. 2R.* *July 8*, 1085.
Nature of Proposals — Memorandum ordered, *July 4*, 445 ; Presented, *July 5*, 621.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *July 1*, 265.
Com. July 4*, 390.
Rep.* *July 5*, 602.
3R.* *July 7*, 919.
c. 1R.* *July 8*, 1087.
Nature of Proposals — Memorandum ordered, *July 13*, 1460.

Electric Power
Supply of, to Districts, Date of presenting Return as to.
Q. Mr. J. Ellis ; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 11*, 1192.

Electric Power Undertakings
Names of Companies who have obtained Acts, etc., and particulars as to districts in which powers have been obtained—Return ordered, *July 12*, 1349.

Electric Railways
See under Railways.

Electricity
Mines, in — Recommendations of Committee.
Qs. Mr. Markham ; *As.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 7*, 945, 946.

Eliot, Sir C.
Administratorship of, in East Africa, *see under* Africa, East.

Ellenborough, Lord
Merchant Shipping Bill, 3R., *July 7*, 721.
Navy Interpreters—Facilities and inducements for learning Foreign Languages, increase in, etc., *July 8*, 1070–1077.

Ellis, Mr. J. E.—*Temporary Chairman of Committees* [Nottingham, Rushcliffe]
Aliens Bill, Abandonment of, *July 7*, 980.
Colonial Office Vote, Date of taking, *July 11*, 1223 ; *July 13*, 1490.
Electric Power, Supply of, to Districts, Date of presenting Return as to, *July 11*, 1192.
Finance Bill, Date of proceeding with, *July 4*, 487.
Licensing Bill.
Com., June 29, 78.
Date of taking, *July 12*, 1368.
Procedure Resolutions, *July 1*, 321, 345 ; *July 4*, 527.
Port of London Bill, Date of taking—Removing Discharge from Order Book, *July 11*, 1222.
Transvaal.
Census, tabling Summary of—Dutch and English in Pretoria and Johannesburgh, etc., *July 4*, 454.
Legislative Council—Names of Members with Official Positions or Avocations, *July 4*, 454.

Emmott, Mr. A. [Oldham]
Cotton Industry—Income Tax Assessment on Contributions to British Cotton growing Association, *July 4*, 448.
Divisions, Members personally or pecuniarily interested in—Liability to have vote struck off, *July 6*, 911.
Licensing Bill.
Com., June 29, 109 ; *July 5*, 753 ; *July 11*, 1275, 1293 ; *July 13*, 1512.
Procedure Resolution, *July 1*, 350, 356 ; *July 5*, 684.
Militia — South African War Service — Adding South Africa to Colours, *July 4*, 453.

Employment of Children
See under Children.

Enfield Small Arms Factory
- Rifles, Number Manufactured and Cost per Head, 1889-1894.
  - *Q.* Mr. Shackleton ; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 11*, 1196-1197.

Enniskillen
- Dispensary Districts -Submitting Records to Guardians.
  - *Q.* Mr. Jordan ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 477-478.
- Fair Rents—Date of Appeal Sittings.
  - *Q.* Mr. E. Mitchell ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 476.
- Post Office—Missing Postal Orders—Refunding Amount to Sender.
  - *Q.* Mr. Jordan ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 30*, 176.

Esmonde, Sir T. G. [Wexford, N.]
- Ancient Monuments, Acquisition and Inspection of, by the Board of Works, *July 7*, 1018.
- Arklow Harbour, Defects of Dredger for, etc., *July 7*, 1022.
- Fisheries on South-East Irish Coast—Condition of Industry, *July 4*, 450 ; *July 11*, 1210.
- Grand Canal, Administration of, *July 7*, 1018.
- Harbour Authorities, Powers of—Introducing Bill for Transfer to County Councils, *July 11*, 1210.
- Marine Works Bill, Introduction of, proposed, *July 7*, 1025.
- Phœnix Park, Up-keep of—Removal of Decayed and Fallen Trees, *July 7*, 1018.
- Piers and Harbours—Legislation to Sanction Transfer of Powers to County Councils, proposed, *July 1*, 318.
- Public Departments, Contracts for Supplies to—Advertising in Local Papers, *July 7*, 1019.
- Tara, Hill of, Steps Taken to Prevent Excavations on, *July 7*, 1018.
- Works, Board of.
  - Constitution and Administration of, *July 7*, 1017.
  - Harbours, Grants for, Discontinuance of, *July 7*, 1021.
  - Loans, Delay in Dealing with Applications for, Rate of Interest, etc., *July 7*, 1020.

Evans, Mr. S. T. [Glamorgan Mid]
- Licensing Bill.
  - *Com.*, *June 29*, 37, 55, 69, 76, 101 ; *July 11*, 1288, 1297 ; *July 12*, 1390.
  - Procedure Resolution, *July 4*, 543, 545 ; *July 5*, 672, 673, 707.

Evictions, Ireland.
- Ballinagore, Farm at, Police Protection of Herd on.
  - *Q.* Mr. Sullivan ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 148.
- Ballymacrossin Estate—Reinstatement of evicted Tenant.
  - *Q.* Mr. Delany ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 963, 964.
- Blennerhasset Estate, Sale of—Reinstatement of evicted Tenant.
  - *Q.* Mr. T. O'Donnell ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 795.
- Collierstown—Reinstatement of Frederick Morres.
  - *Q.* Mr. Sheehy ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 13*, 1488, 1489.
- Estates Commissioners, powers of, as to reinstatements.
  - *Os.* Mr. Delany, *July 7*, 1009 ; Mr. Wyndham, 1012.
- Galway, Number of Applications from evicted Tenants in—Number of Reinstatements, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Kilbride ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 11*, 1213-1214.
- Macgillicuddy, The, Estate of—Reinstatement of evicted Tenant.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Murphy ; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 793, 794.
- Rattigan's Estate, Edgeworthstown, Evictions on—Attitude of Tenants, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 29*, 21.
- Reinstatement of Tenants, delay in.
  - *Os.* Mr. Cullinan, *July 7*, 986 ; Mr. Wyndham, 998 ; Mr. T. O'Donnell, 1003 ; Mr. Murphy, 1005 ; Mr. Delany, 1008, 1009 ; Mr. J. Redmond, *July 8*, 1110, 1111 ; Mr. T. O'Donnell, 1119.
- Shinrone, King's County—Case of A. P. Doolan.
  - *Q.* Mr. Reddy ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 165-166.
- Tuberkeen, Dungloe—Application of G. Ward for Reinstatement.
  - *Qs.* Mr. H. Law ; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 452 ; *July 7*, 967.
- Warren's Court Estate, Cork—Application for Reinstatement from D. Murphy.
  - *Q.* Mr. Sheehan ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 11*, 1214.

Excise
See Customs and Excise.

Exports and Imports
- Coal—Total Quantity above 6*s.* a Ton exported 1902-3.
  - *Q.* Mr. C. Douglas ; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *June 29*, 8.
- Irish cured fish, American duty on—Inducing withdrawal proposed.
  - *Qs.* Mr. T. O'Donnell, Mr. Flavin ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 794.
  - *Q.* Mr. Boland ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 967

Factories and Workshops
- Cotton Cloth Factories, Ventilation of—Report presented, *June 29*, 4 ; *June 30*, 119.
- Report, Annual, presented, *July 4*, 391 443.
  - Delay in publishing, Cause of.
    - *Q.* Sir C. Dilke ; *A.* Mr. Cochrane, *July 11*, 1206-1207.

Fair Rents, Ireland
- Appeals.
  - Number heard and disposed of during past year.
    - *O.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 7*, 989.
  - Number Outstanding.
    - *Os.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 7*, 989–991 ; Mr. Wyndham, 996, 997 ; Mr. T. O'Donnell, 1002.
  - Waste of time and money resulting from.
    - *O.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 995, 996.
- Commissioners engaged in, Number of.
  - *Os.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 7*, 989 ; Mr. Wyndham, 1012.
- Enniskillen, Date of Appeal Sittings at.
  - *Q.* Mr. E. Mitchell ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 476.
- First and second term rents, Number of reductions effected.
  - *O.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 7*, 989.
- Innishowen Districts, Number of Applications and Appeals pending from, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. O'Doherty ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 149–150.
- Kerry, hearing delayed Appeals from.
  - *Qs.* Mr. T. O'Donnell, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Flavin ; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 651.
- Originating Notices, Delay in hearing.
  - *O.* Mr. T. O'Donnell, *July 7*, 1002.

Farquharson, Dr. R. [Aberdeenshire, W.]
- Aberdeenshire—Absence of Swine Fever—Re-considering Regulations imposed. *June 30*, 163–164.
- Nigeria, Northern—Military operations, Information as to, *July 13*, 1473.

Farrell, Mr. J. P. [Longford, N.]
- Ballinacross, Farm of Mr. J. Robinson at—Application for sale, *July 6*, 776.
- Ballymahan, Inspection of Weights and Measures at, selecting convenient Time for, *June 29*, 26.
- King-Harman (Kenagh) Estate, Sales on, Number of, etc., *July 4*, 449.
- Longford
  - Dernageas Farm, Suggested purchase of, to enlarge small Holdings, etc., *June 29*, 21.
  - Drainage of Tributary from Mullagharowmeen to Camlin River, *July 5*, 631–632.
  - Paupers, English and Scotch, deported to, *July 5*, 632.

Farrell, Mr. J. P.—*cont.*
- O'Brien Estate, position of negotiations for sale of, *July 6*, 776.
- Peat.
  - Factory at Inny Junction, Success of, etc., *July 4*, 449.
  - Gas produced from—Success of Experiments—Establishing Industry in Ireland, *July 4*, 450.
- Rattigan's Estate, Edgeworthstown, Evictions on—Attitude of Tenants, etc., *June 29*, 21.

Felixstowe
- Martello Tower—Sale of land by private negotiation.
  - *Q.* Mr. Buchanan ; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *July 7*, 954.

Fellowes, Mr. A. E. [Huntingdonshire, Ramsey]
- Aberdeenshire—Absence of Swine Fever—Re-considering Regulations imposed, *June 30*, 164.
- Agriculture Leaflets 7, 17, 37, 59 and 71, reprinting, *July 5*, 646.
- Ordnance Survey Department—Reduction of Divisional Officer's Pay for visiting Sick Wife—Restoring Pay, *July 11*, 1208.
- Profits, Average Annual, from Agriculture in Great Britain, *July 11*, 1208.
- Solway Fishery Bill, Date of introducing, *July 4*, 471.

Fenians
- Canada, Raids in, in 1866, 1868 and 1870—Medals granted for services in repelling raids.
  - *Q.* Mr. Moon ; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 6*, 780.

Ferguson, Mr. R. C. M. [Leith Burghs]
- Licensing Bill, *Com. July 6*, 844, 883 ; *July 12*, 1397.

Fergusson, Rt. Hon. Sir J. [Manchester, N.E.]
- Licensing Bill.
  - *Com.*, *June 29*, 74.
  - Procedure Resolution, *July 5*, 708.

Field, Mr. W. [Dublin, St. Patrick]
- Congested Districts Board.
  - Examinations for Temporary Clerkships, Reason for abolishing, *July 5*, 657–658.
  - Recruiting Staff from permanent Civil Service Men, etc., *July 5*, 658.
- Lymph, Cost of procuring from Calves—Disposal of Calves, etc., *July 5*, 644, 645.
- National School Teachers, Salaries of, increasing to Standard of English Teachers, *July 5*, 658.

Filey Improvement Bill
c. Report from Police and Sanitary Committee, *June 30*, 138.
Con. July 5*, 618.
3R.* *July 8*, 1085.
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.* July 11*, 1146.

Finance Act, 1902
Section 8, Duty-Free Spirits, taking Advantage of.
Q. Mr. L. Sinclair ; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *June 29*, 8–9.

Finance Bill
Date of taking.
Os. Mr. S. Buxton, Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 12*, 1367.
Qs. Mr. Whitley ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 29*, 33–34.
Q. Mr. J. Ellis ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 4*, 487.
Qs. Mr. Lambert, Mr. MacCrae ; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *July 5*, 642.
Taxes, proposed new, Enforcement of.
Q. Mr. E. Robertson ; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *June 29*, 20.

Financial Secretary to the Admiralty
Mr. E. G. Pretyman.

Financial Secretary to the War Office
Mr. W. Bromley-Davenport.

Findlay Estate
Purchase of.
Delay in proceedings alleged.
Qs. Mr. V. Kennedy ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 971, 972.
Non-delivery of Receivable Orders to Tenants, etc.
Qs. Mr. V. Kennedy ; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 473–474.

First Commissioner of Works
Lord Windsor.

First Lord of the Admiralty
Earl of Selborne.

First Lord of the Treasury
Mr. Arthur J. Balfour.

Fisher, Mr. W. H. [Fulham]
Army Horses—Epizootic Lymphangitis' Introduction of, from South Africa—Method employed to eradicate disease, etc., *July 8*, 1093.

Fisheries
Ireland.
Cured Fish, American duties on, Inducing withdrawal of proposed.
Qs. Mr. T. O'Donnell, Mr. Flavin ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 794.
Q. Mr. Boland ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 967.

Fisheries—*cont.*
Ireland—*cont.*
Fish-Curing Stations on West Coast, Conditions made by Congested Districts Board for letting.
Q. Mr. Sheehan ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 483.
Portasantal, Construction of Sea Wall and Boat Slip at.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty ; *A.* Mr. ham, *July 5*, 633.
Report (1903) presented, *July 11*, 1185 ; *July 12*, 1326.
South East Coast, Condition of Industry on.
Qs. Sir T. Esmonde ; *As.* Mr. ham, *July 4*, 450 ; *July 11*, 1210.
Scotland.
Report, Annual, presented, *July 6*, 771 ; *July 7*, 920.
Whaling—Report presented, *July 1*, 266, 317.
Sea.
North Eastern Sea Fisheries District, Variation of—Order presented, *July 12*, 1326, 1348.
North Sea—Investigation, Inducing French Government to participate in.
Q. Mr. Weir ; *A.* Earl Percy, *June 30*, 143.
Trawling, *see that title.*

Fison, Mr. F. W. [Yorkshire, W.R., Doncaster]
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *July 13*, 1506.

Fitzmaurice, Lord E. G. [Wiltshire, Cricklade].
Education — Endowments of Schools —Application of Surplus Amounts, *July 13*, 1464.
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *July 6*, 813, 814, 822.

Flavin, Mr. M. J. [Kerry, N.]
Ballinasloe Union Medical Officer, Salary of, *July 6*, 801.
Butter, Irish Salt Firkin — Number of Prosecutions for Excessive Moisture, *July 13*, 1486, 1487.
Derrygoolan Estate — Tenants' Right to Shooting—Police Interference, *July 11*, 1212.
Fair Rent Appeals, Delays in Hearing, *July 5*, 651.
Fish, Cured, American Import Duty on, *July 6*, 794.
Kerry.
Parish Committees, Exclusion of Shopkeepers from—Reason for Rule—Suggested Withdrawal, *June 30*, 171.
South, Congested Estates for Sale in—Number, Price Demanded, etc., *July 4*, 479.

[*cont.*

Flavin, Mr. M. T.—*cont.*

Land Purchase—Kerry, Arbitrary Action of Landlords in, *June 30*, 168.

Tobacco Cultivation Experiments in Ireland, Arrangements for, *July 6*, 798.

Transvaal, Importation of Chinese Labour to—Escape and Capture of two Coolies, Alleged, *July 11*, 1324.

Unemployed of Working Classes, Transvaal Labour for, *July 11*, 1219.

Flower, Sir E. F. S. [Bradford, W.]

Borstal Prison—Attacks on Warders, etc., *July 13*, 1480.

Flynn, Mr. J. C. [Cork, N.]

Education, Intermediate.

Commission of Inquiry in Ireland—Constitution, Terms of Reference, etc., *July* 12, 1361, 1362.

Inspection, Establishing System of, *July 5*, 649.

Irish Agricultural Organisation Society, Money paid to, by Agricultural Department—Reasons for, *July 6*, 793.

Kanturk Land Appeals, Reasons for Hearing, in Killarney, *July 12*, 1365.

Land (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 8*, 1115.

Tibet Expedition.

Armistice, Request for—Empowering British Commanders to treat with Negotiators, etc., *July 4*, 466.

Progress of Negotiations, Character of the Expedition, Government Policy, etc., *July 6*, 914.

Food.

Adulteration of, *see title* Adulteration of Food and Drugs.

Foreign Office

Secretary of State — Marquess of Lansdowne.

Under-Secretary—Earl Percy.

Foreshore Reclamation

Scheme for, Appointing Departmental Committee to consider.

Q. Mr. Crooks; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 11*, 1219.

Forest Gate

Barrack School, proposed purchase of, by West Ham Board of Guardians, alleged.

Qs. Mr. Lough; *As.* Mr. G. Lawson, *July 13*, 1481, 1482.

Fortune-telling

Frauds in connection with—Instructing Police to Prosecute, Number of Prosecutions, etc.

Q. Mr. J. Campbell; *A.* Mr. Cochrane, *July 5*, 643-644.

Q. Mr. J. Campbell; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 12*, 1357.

Foster, Sir B. W. [Derbyshire, Ilkeston]

Aden Hinterland, Information as to Affairs in, *July 12*, 1351.

Gosberton—Purchase of Land for Allotments, Refusal to sanction Loan for, *July 4*, 446.

Infant Mortality, High Rate of—Issuing Circular as to encouraging Poor People to apply for Early Medical Relief, etc., *July 11*, 1192.

Poor Law Outdoor Medical Relief in the Metropolis, arrangements for—Report proposed, *July 6*, 774.

Post Office—Central Office, Meal Reliefs in, altering Arrangements as to, *July 11*, 1189.

Transvaal, Importation of Chinese Labour to—Beri-Beri Outbreak—The "Tweedale," Suggested Discharge of, from Service, *July 4*, 464.

Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir H. H. [Wolverhampton, East]

Colonial Office Vote, Date of taking, *July 13*, 1491.

Corfu—English Cemetery — Reason for exchange of site, etc., *July 8*, 1089

Licensing Bill.

Com., *July 13* 1531, 1532.

Procedure Resolution, *July* 1, 372, 374, 375, 377-379, 385.

France

Arbitration Treaty with Great Britain, Particulars as to, Postponement of Questions on, for a short period.

Qs. Mr. G. Bowles, *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 6*, 802, 803.

North Sea Fisheries Investigation, taking part in.

Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Earl Percy, *June 30*, 143.

Trade Report presented, *July 4*, 391, 441.

Galloway, Mr. W. J. [Manchester, S.W.]

Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *July 13*, 1495.

Galway

Evicted Tenants in—Numbers of Applications and Reinstatements, etc.

Q. Mr. Kilbride; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 11*, 1213, 1214.

Queen's College.

Number of Candidates passing B.A. examinations at Royal University (1899-1903).

Qs. Mr. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 13*, 1460-1462, 1482.

Session, Duration of.

Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 12*, 1363.

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill
l Report from Select Committee, *July 4*, 390.
*Com.** *July 5*, 602.
Rep.* *July 7*, 919.
3R.* *July 8*, 1050.
c 1R.* *July 8*, 1087.
Nature of Proposals — Memorandum ordered, *July 13*, 1460.

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill.
l *Com.** *July 5*, 602.
Rep.* *July 7*, 919.
3R.* *July 8*, 1050.
c 1R.* *July 8*, 1087.
Nature of Proposals — Memorandum ordered, *July 5*, 768.

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill
c. 2R.* *July 5*, 618.
Nature of Proposals — Memorandum Ordered, *July 13*, 1459.

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 3) Bill
c. 2R.* *July 12*, 1346.
Nature of Proposals — Memorandum Ordered, *July 13*, 1460.

Glasgow
Parcels from Tynan, Carriage of—Rates Charged.
Q. Mr. T. W. Russell; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 4*, 445.

Glasgow and South Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill
l. 2R.* *June 30*, 118.
3R.* *July 1*, 266.
c. 1R.* *July 4*, 442.
2R.* *July 12*, 1246.

Glasgow Corporation (Police) Order Confirmation Bill
c. 2R.* *July 5*, 618.
*Con.** *July 7*, 943.
3R.* *July 11*, 1182.
l. 1R.* and 2R.* *July 12*, 1325.

Glen (Kerry)
Boat Slip, Expenditure on Extension of, etc.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 12*, 1364.

Glounbawn
Railway Level Crossing, Closing of.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 4*, 486.

Gordon, Duke of (Duke of Richmond)
Sat first in Parliament, *July 11*, 1145.

Gordon, Major W. Evans [Tower Hamlets, Stepney]
Aliens Bill—Re-introduction next Session, *July 11*, 1221.
United States and Abyssinia, Commercial Treaty between, *June 29*, 7.

Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir. J. E. [Cambridge University]
Licensing Bill.
Com., *June 29*, 67; *July 11*, 1248; *July 12*, 1402.
Procedure Resolution, *July 1*, 361, 362; *July 5*, 697.

Gosberton
Land for Allotments, Purchase of, Refusal to sanction Loan for.
Q. Sir W. Foster; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *July 4*, 446–447.

Govan Corporation Order Confirmation Bill
l. 2R.* *June 30*, 118.
3R.* *July 1*, 266.
c. 1R.* *July 4*, 442.
2R.* *July 12*, 1346.

Government Departments
Securities — Return Presented, *June 30*, 141.

Government Departments, Ireland
Contracts for Supplies to—Advertising in local papers.
Os. Sir T. Esmonde, *July 7*, 1019; Mr. V. Cavendish, 1023.

Government Laboratory
Report presented, *July 6*, 770; *July 7*, 920.

Government Ships Bill
Provisions of—Explanatory Memorandum Presented, *July 13*, 1459.

Grant, Mr. C. [Warwickshire, Rugby]
Transvaal, Importation of Chinese Labour to—Beri-beri Outbreak—Delay in receiving Despatches from Lord Milner, *June 30*, 156.
Tyneside Tramways and Tramroads Bill, *Con. June 30*, 258.

Granville Knox Estate, Mayo
Sale of—Memorial from Tenants.
Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 11*, 1212–1213.

Great Central & Midland Joint Railways Bill
c. Lords' Amendments *Con.** *July 4*, 438.

Great Central Railway Bill
l. 3R* *July 1*, 265.
c. Lords' Amendments, *Con.** *July 8*, 1085.

Great Eastern Railway Bill
l. 3R., *July 8*, 1050.
Post Office Servants and Mails, conveyance of, by Motor Car Service.
Os. Marquess of Londonderry, *July 8*, 1051; Lord Balfour of Burleigh, 1052–1054.

Great Northern Railway Bill
c. Lords' Amendments, *Con.** *June 30*, 137.

Great Western Railway Bill
c. Rep.* *July 12*, 1346.

Great Yarmouth Corporation Bill
c. Report from Police and Sanitary Committee, *June 29*, 2.

Greencastle
Police Force, re-instating Sergeant Gallagher in charge of.
Qs. Mr. J. Devlin, Mr. Sloan, Mr. Macveagh ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 653-654.

Greene, Sir E. W. [Bury St. Edmunds]
Alien Pauper Lunatics and Convicts, Statistics as to, *July 11*, 1207.
Parliamentary Elections—Re-distribution of Seats, Prospect of Bill for, *July 11*, 1221.

Greene, Mr. H. D. [Shrewsbury]
Indian Army Courts Martial—Regulations as to Attendance of Deputy-Judge-Advocate, *July 6*, 779, 780.
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 86, 99 ; *July 5*, 730 ; *July 13*, 1530.

Greenwich
Royal Hospital School—Cashier and Store Officer, Increase of Salary of—Order presented, *June 30*, 120, 141.

Grey, Earl
British India Steam Navigation Company Agreement with Conference Lines, Date of, *July 12*, 1333, 1338, 1339.

Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. [Northumberland, Berwick]
Licensing Bill.
Com. June 29, 39, 72 ; *July 11*, 1252, 1256 ; *July 12*, 1378, 1383, 1396, 1398, 1405 ; *July 13*, 1507, 1508, 1544.
Procedure Resolution, *July 5*, 694.

Griffith, Mr. E. J. [Anglesey]
Licensing Bill.
Allotted Day, *July 5*, 763.
Com., *June 29*, 72 ; *July 6*, 827, 879 ; *July 12*, 1409 ; *July 13*, 1543, 1558.
Procedure Resolution, *July 5*, 698.

Groves, Mr. [Salford, S.]
Licensing Bill, *Com. July 6*, 811.

Guns, *see under* Army.

Haldane, Rt. Hon. R. B. [Haddington]
Parish Charities, Scotland, Granting Return of, *July 5*, 1187.

Halifax, Viscount
Transubstantiation, King's Declaration against—Alteration in form of Words Proposed, *July 1*, 310.

Hall, Mr. E. M. [Lancashire, Southport]
Licensing Bill.
Com. July 12, 1412.
Procedure Resolution, *July 4*, 548, 549, 551.

Hall-Marking of Foreign Plate Bill
l. 2R. *July 5*, 604.
Rep.* *July 8*, 1055.
Report from Standing Committee, *July 12*, 1327.

Halsbury, Earl of—*Lord Chancellor.*
Authority of the Lord Chancellor as Speaker of the House of Lords, *June 30*, 121.
De Morley Barony — Claimant to, Erroneously stated to be a Peer of the Realm by the Judge of the City of London Court, *July 8*, 1083.
Rules of Order, Transgression of, *July 7*, 928.
Transubstantiation, King's Declaration against—Alteration in form of Oath Proposed, *July 1*, 300, 305.

Hamilton Gas Order Confirmation Bill
l. 2R.* *July 1*, 266.
Com. *July 12*, 1325.

Harbours
see Piers and Harbours.

Hardinge, Viscount
Militia—Compulsory Service, Advantages of, *July 11*, 1162-1164.

Harlech Estate, Sligo
Sale of Grazing Farm over Heads of Small Tenants, making Inquiry into, etc.
Q. Mr. O'Dowd ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 656-657.

Harrogate Waterworks Tramroad Bill
c. Rep.* *July 1*, 315.
Con. *July 8*, 1085.

Hartismere, Lord
Sat first in Parliament after the death of his father, *July 7*, 917.

Harwood, Mr. G. [Bolton.]
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *July 12*, 1396.

Hawkesbury, Lord
De Morley Barony—Claimant to, erroneously stated to be a Peer of the Realm by the Judge of the City of London Court, *July 8*, 1083.

Hay, Mr. C. G. D. [Shoreditch, Hoxton.]
Customs Clerks, Junior Assistant—Promotions for Special Checking Work, Alleged, *July 1*, 319.

Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir A. D. [Walsall.]
Army.
Harness, Saddlery, Accoutrements, and Transport Vehicles, Reasons of Reduction in Stores of, *June 30*, 203.
Reform Proposals — Date of Making Statement—Opportunity for discussion, etc., *July 13*, 1492, 1493.

Hayti
Trade Report, Presented, *July 7*, 920.

Healy, Mr. T. M. [Louth, N.]
Land (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 8*, 1133.

Heaton, Mr. J. H. [Canterbury.]
Malay Peninsula—Construction of Railway — Convention with Sultan of Johore, etc., *July 13*, 1473.

Helme, Mr. N. W. [Lancashire, Lancaster.]
Licensing Bill.
Com., July 5, 727; *July 12*, 1371; *July 13*, 1500, 1520.
Procedure Resolution, *July 4*, 552, 555.

Hemphill, Rt. Hon. C. H. [Tyrone, N.]
Land Judge's Court, Inadequate Number of Judges in — Reasons for Non-appointment of Mr. Lynch and Mr. M. O'Brien, *July* 7, 1010.
Land Purchase—Untenanted Land, Question of Bonus for, *July 7*, 1011.

Henderson, Mr. A. [Durham, Barnard Castle]
Licensing Bill, *Com., July 12*, 1401; *July 13*, 1517.
Tyneside Tramways and Tramroads Bill, *Con., June 30*, 255.

Heneage, Lord
Army—Staff Appointments, Increase in Number of — Seconding of Officers, Term of Appointments, etc., *July 8*, 1055-1060.
Education—Pupil Teachers, New Regulations as to training of, *July 7*, 936.

Henniker, Lord
Representative Peer for Ireland—Right to Vote at Elections, *July 1*, 265; *July 5*, 601; *July* 7, 917.
Sat first in Parliament after the Death of his Father, *July 7*, 917.

Hereford, Lord Bishop of
Education (Transferred Schools) Bill, 2R., *July 4*, 431.

Hermon-Hodge, Sir R. T. [Oxon, Henley]
Tyneside Tramways and Tramroads Bill, *Con., June 30*, 257.

Herries, Lord
Education—Pupil Teachers, New Regulations as to Training of — Grant for Travelling Expenses, etc., *July 7*, 930.
Transubstantiation, King's Declaration against—Alteration in form of Oath, proposed, *July 1*, 298.

Hickson Estate, Kerry
Proceedings against Tenants—Demand for Hanging Gale, etc.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 166-168.

Higham, Mr. [Yorks., W.R., Sowerby]
Licensing Bill, *Com., July 13*, 1508.

Hobhouse, Mr. C. E. H. [Bristol, E.]
Africa, South, Government Stores in, Sale of; by Colonel Morgan, Report as to, *July 5*, 634.
Army.
Contracts—Fair Wages Resolution, and the employment of Union or Non-Union Workmen — case of Messrs. Lysaght, *July 6*, 782, 783; *July 13*, 1475.
Horses—Epizootic Lymphangitis, Introduction of, from South Africa, *July 13*, 1476.
Medical Department—Annual Report, Cost of — Date of presenting — Cause of Delay, etc., *July 5*, 634.
Licensing Bill, *Com., July 6*, 845.
Navy Contracts—Fair Wages Resolution and the Employment of Union or Non-Union Workmen—Case of Messrs. Lysaght, *July 6*, 781; *July 13*, 1474.
Somaliland Administration — European Staff required, strength of garrison, etc. *July 6*, 787, 788.

Hobhouse, Rt. Hon. H. [Somersetshire, E.]
Licensing Bill.
Com., July 6, 851, 853, 857; *July 11*, 1257; *July 12*, 1372, 1374; *July 13*, 1499, 1501.
Procedure Resolution, *July 1*, 344, 345; *July 5*, 691, 696.

Holyrood Palace
Condition of, Expenditure on improvements, etc.
Qs. Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Caldwell, *June 30*, 229; Lord Balcarres, 230.

Holywood Tramways Bill
c. Rep.* *July 7*, 943.

Home Office
Secretary of State—Mr. A. Akers-Douglas.
Under-Secretary—Mr. T. H. A. E. Cochrane.

"Homewood"
Mutiny on, alleged—Composition of Crew.
Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 12*, 1357, 1358.

Hope, Mr. J. F. [Sheffield, Brightside]
Army—Quick-firing Guns for the Artillery, delay in provision of, etc., *June 30*, 187.

[cont.

Hope, Mr. J. F.—*cont.*
Licensing Bill.
Com., June 29, 80; *July 13*, 1496.
Procedure Resolution, *July 1*, 379; *July 5*, 674.
Navy—Shipbuilding—Distributing Balance of Orders for Programme 1903, *July 5*, 621.

Horner, Mr. F. W. [Lambeth, N.]
Ludgate Circus Post Office, Hours of duty at, *July 7*, 949.

Horses
Accidents caused by, in comparison with Motor Accidents.
Q. Mr. Scott-Montagu; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 6*, 772.
Army—Epizootic Lymphangitis, Introduction of, from South Africa—Method employed to eradicate disease etc.
Q. Mr. H. Fisher; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 8*, 1093.;
Q. Mr. C. Hobhouse *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *July 13*, 1476.

Houldsworth, Sir W. H. [Manchester, N.W.]
Licensing Bill, *Com., July 11*, 1229, 1243.

House of Commons
See under Parliament.

House of Lords
See under Parliament.

Humber Commercial Railway and Dock Bill
c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.* July 4*, 438.

Hunt, Mr. R. [Shropshire, Ludlow]
Army—Rifles, New Pattern, Testing of, Strength of Recoil, etc., *June 30*, 199.
Licensing Bill, *Com., July 12*, 1385.

Hutchinson, Dr. C. F. [Sussex, Rye]
Licensing Bill.
Com., July 13, 1503.
Procedure Resolution, *July 5*, 676, 677.
Transvaal, Importation of Chinese Labour to—Beri-beri Outbreak—Delay in Receiving Despatches from Lord Milner, *June 30*, 156.

Hyde Park
Motor Cars in—Speed Regulations, etc.
Os. Mr. Scott-Montagu, Mr. Whitley, Mr. Disraeli, *June 30*, 263, 264.
Roads, Condition of.
O. Mr. Tennant, *June 30*, 234.
Row, Extension of, Proposed.
Os. Mr. G. Bowles, *June 30*, 232; Mr. Labouchere, 233.

Hyde Park Corner
Slippery State of Wood Pavement—Provision of Gravel Proposed.
Q. Mr. H. C. Richards; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *July 6*, 773.

Hygiene
Teaching of, in Scotch Schools.
Q. Sir J. Leng; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *July 11*, 1188.
Q. Sir J. Leng; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *July 11*, 1190-1191.

Idaho
Trade Report, presented, *July 7*, 920.

Ilford Urban District Council Bill
l. 3R.* *July 4*, 389.
c. 1R.* *July 4*, 442.
2R.* *July 13*, 1457.

Illig
Capture of—Use of Explosive Bullets.
Q. Mr. J. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *June 29*, 9.

Imports
See Exports and Imports.

Income Tax
Abatement of, for Co-operative Societies.
Q. Mr. L. Sinclair; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *June 29*, 8.
Cotton Trade—Assessing Income Tax on Contributions to British Cotton Growing Association.
Q. Mr. Emmott; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *July 4*, 448.

India
Secretary of State—Mr. St. John Brodrick.
Under-Secretary—Earl of Hardwicke.
Accounts and Estimates—Memorandum, presented, *July 12*, 1326, 1348.
Army.
Assistant Military Secretary, Appointment of.
Q. Capt. Norton; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 11*, 1204.
Courts Martial—Deputy-Judge-Advocate, Regulations as to attendance of,
Q. Mr. H. D. Greene; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 6*, 779, 780.
Drafts for—Number of men with less than five years to serve.
Q. Capt. Norton; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 13*, 1469-1472.
Guns to be completed for, in present financial year.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *June 30*, 155.
Officers—Purchase of Commissions—Transfer of Sum paid on Transfer to India.
Q. Sir Seymour King; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *June 30*, 152.
Small Arms Factory, Establishment of—Cost, effect on expenditure on supplies from private factories, etc.
Q. Mr. Bell; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 8*, 1091.

[*cont.*

India—*cont.*

Army—*cont.*

Trooping Season—Regiments destined for India, etc.
Q. Capt. Norton; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *June 30*, 153–154.

Uniforms, Changes in, since 1902, Cost, etc.—Return ordered, *July 11*, 1324.

Cable Rate—Obtaining further Reductions.
Q. Sir E. Sassoon; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 30*, 147–148.

Golden Book of, Official Authority for.
Q. Mr. Schwann; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 30*, 148.

Labourers in Mines and Plantations, granting Return as to.
Q. Sir M. Bhownaggree; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 30*, 161.

Liquor and Drugs, Increasing Consumption of—Preventive Legislation.
Q. Mr. H. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 29*, 9, 17–18.

Panna, Administration of — Reason for suspending Chief, etc.
Q. Mr. Schwann; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 30*, 159–160.

Statistical Department, Annual Expenditure on, etc.
Q. Sir M. Bhownaggree; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 30*, 160–161.

Tibet Expedition, *see that title.*

Industrial Schools

See Reformatory and Industrial Schools.

Infant Mortality

High Rate of—Issuing Circular as to encouraging Poor People to apply for early Medical Relief, etc.
Q. Sir W. Foster; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *July 11*, 1192–1193.

Innishowen

Fair Rent Appeals pending from, etc.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 149–150.

Inny Junction, Ireland

Peat Factory at, Success of, etc.
Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 449–450.

Ireland

Lord-Lieutenant.—Earl of Dudley.

Chief Secretary —Mr. George Wyndham.

Lord Chancellor.—Lord Ashbourne.

Attorney-General.—Mr. J. Atkinson.

Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department, *see that title.*

Ancient Monuments, *see that title.*

Annascaul—Valuation of Mr. O'Donnell's Lands—Refunding Excess Taxation.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 452–453.

Ireland—*cont.*

Antrim—Clerk of the Peace, Amalgamating Office of, with that of Belfast, saving effected by, etc.
Qs. Mr. J. Devlin, Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 651–652.

Arklow Harbour — Defects of Dredger provided by the Board of Works.
Qs. Sir T. Esmonde, *July 7*, 1022; Mr. V. Cavendish, 1023.

Ballinacross, Farm of Mr. J. Robinson at —Application for Sale.
Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 776.

Ballinagore, Evicted Farm at, Police Protection of Herd on.
Q. Mr Sullivan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 148.

Ballinascarthy and Timoleague Light Railway—County Guarantee of Company, Levying Rate for Dividend on.
Q. Mr. McFadden; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 631.

Ballinasloe, *see that title.*

Ballingeary, Police Force at—Abolishing Barracks.
Q. Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 166.

Ballybofry, Refusal of Donegal Railway Company to allow through Bookings of Goods to and from.
Q. Mr. McFadden; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *June 30*, 150–151.

Ballydonlon Estate, Sale of—Increase in Instalment Rentals—Holding Inspection, etc.
Q. Mr. Roche: *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 472.

Ballykinlor Camp, Meat Tenders for—Reason for not Accepting Lowest Tender.
Q. Mr. Wood; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 11*, 1198.

Ballymacrossin Estate, Sale of—Reinstatement of evicted Tenant.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 963, 964.

Ballymahan—Inspection of Weights and Measures, selecting Convenient Time for.
Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 29*, 26.

Ballymena and Londonderry, establishing Telephone Service between.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 29*, 6.

Ballynaclosha National School—Income of Principal Teacher.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 448–449.
Q. Mr. P. A. McHugh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 630.

Ballynahinch — Fishing rights — Illegal interference by water bailiffs, alleged.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 795.

[*cont*

Ireland—*cont.*

Bangor.

Harbour, Provision of—question of Grant, etc.
O. Mr. T. L. Corbett, *July 7*, 1024.

Post Office, Improvement in, proposed.
Q. Mr. J. Devlin ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 13*, 1489.

Bateman Estate, Tralee — Demand for Gale Rents—Forcing Tenants to accept Landlord's Terms.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 167-169.

Bawnboy—Tenants of Mr. Humphrey, Recovery of Rent from—Protecting Tenants, etc.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 476.

Belfast, *see that title.*

Blacklion Dispensary, Improvement in condition of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Jordan ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 799, 800.

Blakeney Estate, Galway, Agent of—Taking advantage of the Land Purchase Act, etc.
Q. Roche ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 650.

Blennerhasset Estate, Sale of—Reinstatement of evicted Tenant,
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 795.

Burtonport Railway, *see that title.*

Butter, Salt Firkin—Number of prosecutions for excessive moisture.
Qs. Mr. Flavin, Mr. Lundon, Mr. Kilbride, Mr. O'Shaughnessy ; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 13*, 1486, 1487.

Cappawhite—Sale of Thomas Dowling's Estate, withdrawal of portion, etc.
Qs. Mr. K. O'Brien ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 964, 965.

Carnane Estate, Sale of, proposed, —Addition of owner's name in order to identify estate.
Q. Mr. Lundon ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 962, 963.

Cashel Rural District, Labourers' Cottages in—Delay in erecting Cottage for W. Carroll.
Q. Mr. Condon ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 11*, 1194-1195.

Castleblayney Union, Labourers' Cottages in—Arbitrators' Award for Land—Alleged interested Decision, etc.
Q. Mr. McKean ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 29*, 24-25.

Children's Courts, Number of, Established, etc.
Qs. Mr. H. Law, Mr. Sloan ; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 962.

Ireland—*cont.*

Clanricarde Estate — Game Rights of Tenants.
Qs. Mr. Roche, Mr. Kilbride ; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 795, 796, 797.

Coleraine, Publican at, Alleged Police Persecution of.
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh, Mr. T. O'Donnell ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 169.

Collierstown—Evicted Tenant Frederick Morres, re-instatement of.
Q. Mr. Sheehy ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 13*, 1488, 1489.

Comyn Kenny Estate, Galway, Tenant Purchasers of—Enlarging Uneconomic Holdings.
Q. Mr. Roche ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 654-655.

Congested Districts Board, *see that title.*

Constabulary, Royal Irish, *see that title.*

County Courts Act, 1877—Receipts and Payments (1903-4) — Accounts presented, *June 29*, 4 ; *June 30*, 120.

Criminal and Judicial Statistics 1903—Civil Statistics presented, *July 8*, 1054, 1088.

Criminals—Finger prints, Regulations for taking, presented, *July 12*, 1326, 1348.

Dernageas Farm, Longford, suggested Purchase of, to enlarge Small Holdings, etc.
Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 29*, 21-22.

Development Grant Fund—Date of Presenting Estimate, etc.
Q. Mr. J. Redmond ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 965.

Dingle—Holding of Thomas O' Donnell—Valuation error—Refunding Money, proposed.
Qs. Mr. T. O'Donnell ; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 970-971.

Donegal, *see that title.*

Dowling, Thomas, Estate of—Terms of Sale, Withdrawal of Village of Cappawhite, etc.
Qs. Mr. K. O'Brien ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 964, 965.

Down County, Principal Teacher of—Claim to Increment of Salary.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July, 4*, 450-451.

Dublin, *see that title.*

Education, *see that title.*

Enniskillen.

Dispensary Districts—Submitting Records to Guardians.
Q. Mr. Jordan ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 477-478.

Fair Rents—Date of Appeal Sittings,
Q. Mr. E. Mitchell ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 476.

[*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*

Evictions, *see that title.*

Fair Rent Appeals, *see* Fair Rents, Ireland

Fermanagh, Co.—Alterations in Mails—Improvement in Present System Proposed.
  Q. Mr. E. Mitchell; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 6*, 791.

Finlay Estate, Sale of.
  Delay in Proceedings, Alleged.
    Qs. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 971, 972.
  Non-delivery of Receivable Orders to Tenants, etc.
    Qs. Mr. V. Kennedy; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 473-474.

Fish, Cured, American Import Duties on, Inducing Withdrawal of, Proposed.
  Qs. Mr. T. O'Donnell, Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 794.
  Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 967.

Fisheries, *see* Fisheries—Ireland.

Galway, *see that title.*

Glen (Kerry) Boat Slip, Expenditure on Extension of, etc.
  Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 12*, 1364.

Glenties Workhouse, Improvement in Sanitary Arrangements of, Proposed.
  Q. Dr. Thompson; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 12*, 1352.

Glounbawn, Railway Level Crossing at, Closing of.
  Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 4*, 486.

Grand Canal, Utilisation of—Dispute with the Board of Works, etc.
  Qs. Sir T. Esmond, *July 7*, 1018; Mr. V. Cavendish, 1024.

Granville Knox Estate, Mayo, Sale of—Memorial from Tenants.
  Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 11*, 1212-1213.

Greencastle Police Force, Re-instating Sergeant Gallagher in Charge of.
  Qs. Mr. J. Devlin, Mr. Sloan, Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 653-654.

Harlech Estate, Sligo—Sale of Grazing Farm over Heads of Small Tenants, etc.
  Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 656-657.

Hickson Estate, Kerry - Proceedings against Tenants—Demand for Hanging Gale, etc.
  Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 166-168.

Innishowen, Fair Rent Appeals Pending from, etc.
  Q. Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 149-150.

Ireland—*cont.*

Inny Junction, Peat Factory at, Success of, etc.
  Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 449-450.

Irish Agricultural Organisation Society, Money paid to, by Agriculture Department—Reasons for, etc.
  Qs. Mr. Murphy, Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 792, 793.

Irish Language, *see that title.*

Judicial Statistics 1903—Civil Statistics presented, *July* 8, 1054, 1088.

Kanturk Land Appeals, Reason for hearing, in Killarney.
  Qs. Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 12*, 1365.

Keelnabrach School, Dangerous state of, alleged—Delay in building new school, etc.
  Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 13*, 1484, 1485.

Kenmare Estate, Sale of—Applications received, etc.
  Qs. Mr. Murphy; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 961, 962.

Kerry, *see that title.*

Kilclooney Burial Ground, Enlargement of—Price asked for Land by Congested Districts Board.
  Q. Mr. Roche; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 173.

Kilrea sub-Post Office—central position for new office proposed.
  Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 8*, 1090.

Kilrusheightey, Principal Teacher of, Income of, etc.
  Qs. Mr. P. A. McHugh, Mr. T. O'Donnell; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 646-648.
  Qs. Mr. P. A. McHugh; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 12*, 1360, 1361.

King-Harman (Kenagh) Estate, Sales on Number of, etc.
  Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 449.

Kingston Estate, Purchase of Portion of, by Tenants — Enforcing Landlord's Terms, etc.
  Q. Mr. W. Abraham; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 29*, 24.

Kingstown and Dalkey Polling Districts—Complaints as to tampering with Voters' Requisition Forms.
  Q. Mr. Mooney; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *July 11*, 1209.

Kinsale, Proselytising Practices of Commander Salwey, R.N.—Removal from Kinsale District.
  Q. Mr. Crean; *A.* Mr. Pretyman *July 11*, 1215-1216.

Ireland—*cont.*

Kinvara.

Letter Deliveries—Additional facilities proposed.
Q. Mr. Joyce ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 7*, 974.

Pier and Harbour, Improvement in, proposed.
Q. Mr. Joyce ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 963.

Knocknagin, Delay in erecting National School at.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 951.

Labourers' Cottages Schemes, Number of, etc.
Q. Mr. O'Shee ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 946, 947.

Lace, Counterfeit, sold in Nice as Irish-made lace, alleged.
Q. Mr. Boland ; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 13*, 1478.

Land Act, Land Commission, Land Purchase, etc., *see those titles.*

Land Stock, Method of Issuing.
O. Mr. Coghill, *July 7*, 1014.

Larne Urban District Council, Application from, for Increase in Number of Councillors.
Q. Mr. J. Delvin ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 797.

Leixlip, Acquiring Land for Additional Burial Ground at.
Q. Mr. Leamy ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 451.

Lettir (Kerry) School—Delay in Producing New Plans, Alleged.
Q. Mr. Boland ; *A.* Wyndham, *July 13*, 1484.

Limerick Postmen, Pay of—Increase proposed.
Qs. Mr. Joyce ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 7*, 974.

Listellick Farm, Kerry, Purchase of, by Congested Districts Board.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 169.

Loan Fund Banks, Debenture Holders of, Refunding Money Lost by.
Q. Dr. Thompson ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 11*, 1193.

Londonderry and Ballymena, Establishing Telephone Service between.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 29*, 6.

Longford, *see that title.*

Lurgan, Victoria Street National School—Salary of Teacher—Loss of Income Alleged.
Q. Col. Saunderson ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 13*, 1467–1469.

M'Cartie Estate—Proceedings for Recovery of Rent—Taking Steps to Purchase Estate, etc.
Q. Mr Murphy ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 166–168.

Ireland—*cont.*

Macgillicuddy, The, Estate of—Reinstatement of Evicted Tenent.
Qs. Mr. Murphy ; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 793, 794.

Magherafelt Salters' Company Trust, Administration of.
Q. Mr. J. Devlin ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 13*, 1488.

Local Inquiry, Holding.
Q. Mr. J. Devlin ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 11*, 1214–1215.

Marine Works Bill, Introduction of, proposed.
Os, Sir T. Esmonde, Mr. Wyndham, *July*, 7, 1025.

Maryborough, Confiscation of Gun of Mr. P. Dowling at.
Q. Mr. Delany ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 654.

Mayo Harbour Works, Government Advances for.
Qs. Mr. C. Craig, Mr. MacVeagh ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 479–480.

Miltown Malbay Petty Sessions Clerk.

Election of, Irregularities at, Alleged.
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 968, 969.

Qualifications of, etc
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 655–656.

Mountmellick, Queen's County—Closure of "the Cut" by Military Authorities —Allowing Removal of Peat.
Q. Mr. Delany ; A. Mr. B. Davenport, *July 11*, 1217.

Moy District.

House-to-House Inquiry by Police, Alleged.
Q. Mr. Sloan ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 951, 952.

Nationalist Demonstration—Allowing Procession to proceed by Road from Trew to Moy Station.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh ; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, Mr. Speaker, *July 11*, 1212.

Muir Bay—Trawling within Prohibited Area, Alleged—Date of Visit of the "Granuaile," etc.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 799.

Munster Dairy School—Delay in carrying out Improvements.
Q. Mr. Murphy ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 647–649.

Naas Workhouse –Destruction of Whiskey Polluted with Impure Water—Refunding Duty, proposed.
Q. Mr. Leamy ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 12*, 1354, 1355.

National Gallery.

Report (1903) Presented, *June 29*, 4 ; *June 30*, 119.

[*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*

O'Brien Estate, Position of Negotiations for Sale of.
  Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 776.

Omagh—Street Obstructions, Removal of.
  Q. Dr. Thompson; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *July 12*, 1350.

Owenmore River, Drainage of—Grant in Aid to Local Effort, suggested.
  Qs. Mr. O'Dowd; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 657; *July 7*, 965.

Palmer's Estate, Mayo, Purchase of.
  Q. Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 477.

Piers and Harbours, *see that title.*

Poor Law, *see that title.*

Portasantal, Construction of Sea Wall and Boat Slip at, *July 5*, 633.

Post Office, *see that title.*

Probates, Delay in Granting, in Dublin, Alleged.
  Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *July 7*, 961.

Public Departments, Contracts for Supplies to—Advertising in Local Papers.
  Os. Sir T. Esmonde, *July 7*, 1019; Mr. V. Cavendish, 1023.

Queen's Colleges, *see that title*; *also Names of Places, as* Cork, Belfast, etc.

Rae Estate, Kerry, Purchase of, proposed, by Congested Districts Board.
  Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 174.
  Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham. *July 12*, 1366.

Railways, *see that title.*

Rathmines, *see that title.*

Rattigan's Estate, Edgeworthstown, Evictions on—Attitude of Tenants, etc.
  Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 29*, 21.

Regiments stationed in, *see* Army—Ireland, Regiments in.

Representative Peers—Lord Henniker, Right of, to Vote at Elections, *July 1*, 265; *July 5*, 601; *July 7*, 917.

Roscrea Post Office—Refusal to pay Claim of late Postmaster for structural alterations.
  Q. Mr. K. O'Brien; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 11*, 1190.

Roundstone—Flags displayed on Licensed Premises prohibited by Constables, alleged.
  Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 778.

Royal University—Degree of Bachelor of Arts—Number of Candidates from Queen's Colleges, etc. (1899-1903).
  Qs. Mr. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 13*, 1460-1462, 1482

Ireland—*cont.*

Sherlock Estate, Cork—Affording Opportunity for Tenants to purchase Holdings.
  Q. Capt. Donelan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 11*, 1195-1196.

Shinrone, King's County, Evictions at—Case of A. P. Doolan.
  Q. M. Reddy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 165-166.

Sligo, *see that title.*

Strabane Labourers' Cottages Scheme—Case of Henry McCool.
  Q. Mr. McFadden; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 12*, 1365, 1366.

Strokestown, Drainage of Rivers in District of.
  Q. Mr. J. O'Kelly; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 646.

Tallow—Extra Police requisitioned for one day, Reason for, payment of Expense, etc.
  Q. Mr. O'Shee; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 969.

Tara, Hill of—Steps taken to prevent Excavations on.
  Os. Sir T. Esmonde, *July 7*, 1018; Mr. V. Cavendish, 1024.

Taxes—Cost of Collection, Details of.
  Q. Mr. Lough; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *July 5*, 623-624.

Timoleague and Ballinascarthy Light Railway—County Guarantee, levying Rate for Dividend on.
  Q. Mr. McFadden; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 631.

Tobacco Cultivation Experiments, Arrangements for.
  Qs. Mr. D. Morgan, Mr. Flavin; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 798.

Trinity College, *see under Dublin.*

Ulster, Party Demonstrations in—Maintenance of Public Peace, *June 29*, 22.

Valentia Ferry, Improvement of—Delay in formulating Scheme, alleged.
  Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 966, 967.

Westropp Estate, Sale of.
  Delay in.
    O. Mr. Cullinan, *July 7*, 986.
  Expediting Sale.
    Q. Mr. Sheehy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 652.
  Offers to Tenants.
    Qs. Mr. Sheehy; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 12*, 1363, 1364.

Wicklow, *see that title.*

Workhouses, *see that title.*

Works, Board of, *see that title.*

Irish Agricultural Organisation Society

Money paid to, by Agricultural Department, Reasons for, etc.
  Qs. Mr. Murphy, Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 792, 793.

Irish Constabulary, Royal
See Constabulary, R.I.

Irish Language
National Schools—Payments for Instruction.
Q. Capt. Donelan ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 13*, 1485.
Postal Officials, Examination of, proposed—Resolutions passed by Local Bodies in Ireland, etc.
Qs. Mr. Boland ; *As.* Lord Stanley, *July 12*, 1366, 1367.

Iron and Steel
Production and Consumption in United Kingdom and Foreign Countries—Return ordered, *July 6*, 771, 772 ; Presented, *July 8*, 1089.

Isle of Man
Revenue and Expenditure—Account presented, *July 7*, 944.

Isle of Man (Customs) Bill
c. 1R.* *July 12*, 1368

Italy
Rome, Naval Display at, by British Sailors, Responsibility for—Sanction of Italian Government, etc.
Q. Mr. Sloan ; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 13*, 1462.
Trade Report presented, *July 7*, 920.

Jameson, Maj. J. E. [Clare, W.]
Alcohol for Manufacturing Purposes, Quantity Imported from Germany, *July 6*, 791.
Licensing Bill,
Com., *June 29*, 37, 72.
Procedure Resolution, *July 5*, 664.

Japan
Trade Report Presented, *July 8*, 1054.
War with Russia, *see* Russo-Japanese War.

Jersey, Earl of
Transubstantiation, King's Declaration against—Alteration in form of Oath Proposed, *July 1*, 275.

Jessel, Capt. H. M. [St. Pancras, S.]
London County Council (General Powers) Bill, *June 29*, 98.

Johannesburg
Dutch and English in—Census Returns.
Q. Mr. J. Ellis ; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 4*, 454.

Johnson, Mr. J. [Gateshead]
Ankylostomiasis, Notification of, Rendering, Compulsory, *July 5*, 643.
Licensing Bill, *Com. July 6*, 846.

Johnstone, Mr. J. H. [Sussex, Horsham]
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 85.
London County Council (General Powers Bill, *Con.*, *June 29*, 93, 97.

Joicey, Sir J. [Durham, Chester-le-Street]
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 80 ; *July 13*, 1552, 1553.

Jordan, Mr. J. [Fermanagh, S.]
Blacklion Dispensary, Improvement in Condition of, Proposed, *July 6*, 799.
Enniskillen
Dispensary Districts — Submitting Records to Guardians, *July 4*, 477–478.
Post Office—Missing Postal Orders—Refunding Amount to Sender, *June 30*, 176.
Railways—Excursion Trains in Ireland, Lack of Sanitary Accommodation on alleged, *July 7*, 959.

Joyce, Mr. M. [Limerick]
Kinvara—Letter Deliveries—Additional Facilities, Proposed, *July 7*, 974.
Pier and Harbour, Improvement of, proposed, *July 7*, 963.
Limerick Postmen, Pay of—Increase proposed, *July 7*, 974.
Technical Instruction (Ireland) Act—Granting Return of Officials employed *July 5*, 648.

Judicial Rents, Ireland
See Fair Rents.

Judicial Statistics, Ireland, 1903
Report (Civil Statistics) Presented, *July 8*, 1054, 1088.

Kanturk
Land Appeals, Reason for hearing, in Killarney.
Qs. Mr. Flynn ; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 12*, 1365.

Kearley, Mr. H. E. [Devonport]
Navy.
Devonport Dockyard.
Discharges in, Reasons for, *June 30*, 216.
Police at, Granting rent aid to, *June 30*, 216.
Volunteers, Granting Allowance to meet Expense of Instruction for, *June 30*, 144.
Walsford, W., Devonport Shipwright, Reason for not assigning Pension to, *July 5*, 621–622.
Workmen Permanently Injured. Pensions or Compensation for, *June 30*, 215, 216.

Keelnabrach
School, Dangerous condition of, alleged—Delay in Building New School, etc.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 13*, 1484, 1485.

Kelvin, Lord
Merchant Shipping Act (1894) Amendment Bill, 2R., *June 30*, 134.

Kenmare Estate
Sale of—Applications Received, etc.
Qs. Mr. Murphy; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 961, 962.

Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir J. H. [Devonshire, Honiton]
Licensing Bill.
Com., *June 29*, 73, 81.
Procedure Resolution, *July 4*, 545.

Kennedy, Mr. V. [Cavan, W.]
Bawnboy, Mr. Humphreys' Tenants at, Recovery of Rent from—Judgments set aside—Protection of Tenants, etc., *July 4*, 476-477.
Finlay Estate, Sale of.
Delay in Proceedings, Alleged, *July 7*, 971.
Non-delivery of Receivable Orders to Tenants, etc., *July 4*, 473.
Post Office, Ireland—Learners—Regulations as to age limit, *July 7*, 972.
Ulster, Party Demonstrations in—Maintenance of Public Peace, *June 29*, 22.

Kenyon-Slaney, Col. Sir W. [Shropshire, Newport]
Licensing Bill Procedure Resolution, *July 1*, 384, 385.

Kerry
Fair Rent Appeals from—Hearing Delayed Appeals.
Qs. Mr. T. O'Donnell, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 651.
Parish Committees, Exclusion of Shopkeepers from—Reason for Rule—Suggested Withdrawal.
Qs. Mr. T. O'Donnell, Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 171-172.
Postal Delivery — Daily Deliveries for Townlands in.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 4*, 484.
South, Estates Offered for Sale in—Number—Price Demanded, etc.
Qs. Mr. Bowland, Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 478-479.

Kilbride, Mr. D. [Kildare, S.]
Agricultural Department—Winter Dairying, Steps to Promote, *July 4*, 473.
Alcohol for Manufacturing Purposes, Amount of, Blended and Sold as Whiskey, *July 6*, 791.

Kilbride, Mr. D.—*cont.*
Butter, Irish salt firkin—Number of Prosecutors for excessive moisture, etc., *July 13*, 1487.
Clanricarde Estate, Woodford—Tenants' Right to Shooting, *July 4*, 475; *July 6*, 796, 797.
Derrygoolan—Tenants' Right to Shooting—Police Interference, etc.; *July 11*, 1211.
Galway, Evicted Tenants in—Numbers of Applications and Re-instatements, etc., *July 11*, 1213.
Land (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 8*, 1122.
Meat, Inspection of, for Tuberculosis—Qualifications of Inspectors, *July 12*, 1359.

Kilclooney
Burial Ground, Enlargement of — Price asked by Congested Districts Board for Land.
Q. Mr. Roche; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 173.

Kilrusheightey
National School Teacher, Consolidated Income of, Interpretation of Rule 200, etc.
Qs. Mr. P. A. McHugh, Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 646-648.
Qs. Mr. P. A. McHugh; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 12*, 1360, 1361.

Kincardine
Swine Fever, Absence of—Reconsidering Regulations imposed,
Q. Dr. Farquharson; *A.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *June 30*, 163-164.

King, Sir H. S. [Hull, Central]
Indian Army Officers' Purchase of Commissions—Transfer of Sum paid on Transfer to India, *June 30*, 152.

King-Harman (Kenagh) Estate
Sales on, Numbers of, etc.
Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 449.

King's Declaration against Transubstantiation
see Transubstantiation.

Kingston Estate
Purchase of Portion of, by Tenants—Enforcing Landlord's Terms, etc.
Q. Mr. W. Abraham; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 29*, 24.

Kingstown and Dalkey
Polling Districts — Complaints as to tampering with Voters' Requisition Forms.
Q. Mr. Mooney; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *July 11*, 1209.

Kinsale

Proselytising Practices of Commander Salwey, R.N.—Removal from Kinsale District.
  Q. Mr. Crean; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 11*, 1215–1216.

Kinvara

Letter Deliveries — Additional facilities, proposed.
  Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 7*, 974.

Pier and Harbour, Condition of —Improvement, proposed.
  Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 963.

Kilrea

Sub-Post Office—Central Position for New Office, proposed.
  Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 8*, 1090.

Knocknagin

National School, Delay in erecting.
  Q. Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 951.

Laboratory, Government

Report Presented, *July 6*, 770; *July 7*, 920.

Labouchere, Mr. H. [Northampton]

Africa, East — Syndicate, Concessions granted to, *June 29*, 18.

Hyde Park—Row, Extension of, Proposed, *June 30*, 233.

Licensing Bill Procedure Resolution, *July 1*, 386.

Tibet.

  Expedition—Progress of Negotiations, Character of the Expedition, Government Policy, etc., *July 6*, 914.

  Status of—Chinese Rights—Power to make Treaty with Great Britain. *July 11*, 1203, 1204.

Transvaal, Importation of Chinese Labour to—Contract, Tabling Terms of, *July 4*, 461–462.

Labour Statistics

Charts illustrating, Presented, *July 4*, 391; *July 5*, 621.

Labourers' Cottages, Ireland

Additional Half Acres, Cost of providing.
  Q. Mr. O'Shee; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 11*, 1213.

Cashel Rural District — Delay in erecting Cottage for W. Carroll.
  Q. Mr. Condon; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 11*, 1194–1195.

Castleblayney Union, Arbitrator's Award for Land in—Alleged interested Decision in, etc.
  Q. Mr. McKean; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 29*, 25–26.

Labourers' Cottages (Ireland)—*cont.*

Schemes, Number of.
  Qs. Mr. O'Shee; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 946, 947, 969, 970.

Strabane—Case of Henry McCool, *July 12*, 1365, 1366.

Labourers (Ireland) Act

Registration of title under, Cost of.
  Q. Mr. O'Shee; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 802.

Labourers (Ireland) Act Amendment Bill

Date of Taking.
  Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. W. Moore, *July 6*, 807.

Motion to commit to Standing Committee on Trade.
  Os. Mr. Wyndham, *July 8*, 1094; Mr. W. Moore, 1097, 1098, 1099; Mr. C. Craig, 1099, 1100; Mr. Mr. T. W. Russell, 1101, 1102.

Referring to Committee Proposed.
  Qs. Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. T. W. Russell; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 6*, 804.

Section 13, Omission of, Proposed.
  Os. Mr. W. Moore, *July 8*, 1095; Mr. Wyndham, 1096; Mr. C. Craig, 1099–1101; Mr. T. W. Russell, 1102.

Lambert, Mr. G. [Devonshire, South Molton]

Army Remount Depôt, Purchase of Land at Bitterne for, *July 5*, 638.

Licensing Bill.

  Com., *July 6*, 846.

  Procedure Resolution, *July 1*, 340; *July 5*, 685–688.

Somaliland—Mullah — Present Position, Arms and Strength of following, *July 6*, 787.

Tibet Expedition—Armistice, Request for, Empowering British Commander to treat with Negotiators, etc., *July 4*, 466.

Tobacco Duty—Modifying Budget Proposals, *July 5*, 641–642.

Transvaal.

  Chinese Labour, Importation of—Close Time for Admission of Coolies—Limiting Numbers, *July 4*, 462.

  Legislative Council—Changes in Constitution, proposed, *July 5*, 639.

  Representative Government, Communications as to Grant of, *July 4*, 465.

Lancaster, Duchy of

Chancellor—Sir W. H. Walrond.

Land Act (Ireland) 1903
- Working of
  - *Os.* Mr. Cullinan, *July* 7, 984; Mr. Wyndham, 994, 997; Mr. T. O'Donnell, 1001, 1002; Mr. Power, 1004; Mr. Delany, 1007.

Land (Commission) Ireland
- Collierstown—Reinstatement of Frederick Morres.
  - *Q.* Mr. Sheehy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 13*, 1488, 1489.
- Commissioners.
  - Work of, Unsatisfactory Nature of.
    - *O.* Mr. Cullinan, *July* 7, 985.
- Fair Rents, *see that title.*
- Inspectors — Number, Religious Denominations, etc.
  - *Qs.* Mr. J. Devlin, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Delany; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 13*, 1483, 1484.
- Kanturk—Reason for hearing Appeals in Killarney.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 12*, 1365.
- Report of, Delay in Presenting.
  - *Os.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *July* 7, 988; Mr. Wyndham, 994, 995; Mr. Power, 1003.

Land (Ireland) Bill
- Date of Taking.
  - *Os.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 5*, 768; Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 6*, 807.
- *c.* 2R., *July 8*, 1105.
  - *Debate on Second Reading* [Commons] *July 8*, 1105.
  - Act of 1903, Universal Approval of, by Irish Members, 1112, 1133, 1134.
  - Compulsory Powers of Purchase for Tenants, proposed, 1121, 1129, 1131, 1132.
  - Congested Districts Board, Failure of, to purchase untenanted lands, 1108, 1109, 1122, 1131.
  - "Estate," Powers of Commissioners to define, 1110, 1111.
  - Evicted Tenants, Delay in settlement of, etc., 1110, 1111, 1119, 1124.
    - Estates Commissioners, Powers of, as to, 1124, 1132.
  - First-term Rents and Non-judicial Tenancies, Terms offered by Landlords, etc., 1128, 1129.
  - Framing of the Bill, Objections to, 1106, 1107, 1112, 1115, 1131.
  - Future Annuities and Second-term Rents, Difference of 20 per cent. between, 1125.
  - Increased Price of Land, 1116, 1117, 1125.
  - Inspectors, Appointment of, proposed, 1126.

Lane (Ireland) Bill—*cont.*
- *c.* 2R.—*cont.*
  - Number of Applications, and Amount spent on Land Purchase, 1127.
  - Stamp Duty on Ejectment and Notices to Quit, proposed, 1137.
  - Terms forced on Tenants by Landlords, and payment of arrears, 1111-1114, 1116, 1118, 1122, 1132.
  - Title of Superior Interests, Cost of proving, thrown on the selling Landlord, 1119, 1120.
  - Untenanted Land, Payment of Bonus on Sale of, possibility of, 1107, 1108, 1127.
  - Zone System, Objections to, 1115, 1126, 1135.

Land Judge's Court, Ireland
- Blakeney Estate, Galway, Agent for—Taking Advantage of Land Purchase Act, etc.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Roche; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 173-174; *July 5*-650.
- Congestion in—Sitting during Long Vacation, proposed.
  - *O.* Mr. Lonsdale, *July* 7, 1014.
- Estates Commissioners, Number of Estates bought by—Number of Negotiations pending.
  - *Os.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *July* 7, 992, 993; Mr. Wyndham, 1000.
- Lynch, Commissioner, aad Mr. Murrough O'Brien, Reasons for Non-utilisation of Services of.
  - *Os.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *July* 7, 990; Mr. Hemphill, 1010.
- Prices of Land in, Reasons for Increase in.
  - *O.* Mr. Cullinan, *July* 7, 986, 987.
- Sherlock Estate, Cork—Affording Opportunity for Tenants to Purchase Holdings.
  - *Q.* Capt. Donelan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 11*, 1195-1196.
- Westropp Estate, Action of the Judge in Delaying Sale of.
  - *O*, Mr. Cullinan, *July* 7, 986.

Land Purchase, Ireland
- Act of 1896, Number of Estates Sold under.
  - *O.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *July* 7, 990.
- Ballinacross, Farm of Mr. J. Robinson at—Application for Sale.
  - *Q.* Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 776.
- Ballydonlon Estate, Sale of—Increase in Instalment Rentals—Holding Inspection, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Roche; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 472.
- Bateman Estate, Tralee — Demand for Gale Rents—Forcing Tenants to Accept Landlord's Terms, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 167-169.

[*cont.*

Land Purchase, Ireland—*cont.*

Blakeney Estate, Galway, Taking Advantage of the Act for—Receiver, etc.
Q. Mr. Roche; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 650.

Carnane Estate, Sale of, Proposed—Addition of Name of Owner in order to identify Estate.
Q. Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 962, 963.

Comyn Kenny Estate, Tenant Purchasers of—Enlarging Uneconomic Holdings.
Q. Mr. Roche; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 654–655.

Congested Districts Board, Number of Estates Purchased by.
Qs. Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 7*, 993; Mr. Wyndham, 1001.

Dernageas Farm, Longford, Suggested Division, Fencing, etc., of.
Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 29*, 21–22.

Dowling, Thomas, Estate of—Terms of Sale, Withdrawal of Village of Cappawhite, etc.
Qs. Mr. K. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 964, 965.

Estates Commissioners.

Number of Estates Purchased in the Land Judge's Court—Number of Negotiations Pending, etc.
Qs. Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 7*, 992, 993; Mr. Wyndham, 1000.

Staff, Strength of—Work Accomplished, etc.
Q. Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 7*, 991, 992.

Work in Office of—Allowing Inspectors to furnish Reports without Minute Particulars.
Q. Dr. Thompson; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 11*, 1193–1194.

Evicted Tenants, Delay in Reinstatement of.
Qs. Mr. Cullinan, *July 7*, 986; Mr. Wyndham, 998; Mr. T. O'Donnell, 1003; Mr. Murphy, 1005; Mr. Delany, 1008, 1009; Mr. J. Redmond, *July 8*, 1110, 1111; Mr. T. O'Donnell, 1119.

Powers of Estates Commissioners as to.
Qs. Mr. Delany, *July 7*, 1009; Mr. Wyndham, 1012.

Finlay Estate.

Delay in proceedings, alleged.
Qs. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 971, 972.

Non-delivery of Receivable Orders to Tenants, etc.
Qs. Mr. V. Kennedy; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 473–474.

Granville Knox Estate, Mayo, Sale of—Memorial from Tenants.
Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 11*, 1212–1213.

Land Purchase, Ireland—*cont.*

Harlech Estate, Sligo—Sale of grazing Farm over Heads of Small Tenants, etc.
Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 656–657.

Hickson Estate, Kerry—Proceedings against Tenants—Demand for Hanging Gale, etc.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 166–168.

Kenmare Estate, Applications for sale of.
Qs. Mr. Murphy; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 961, 962.

Kerry, Estates purchased by the Congested Districts Board in, Prices paid for, etc.
Q. Mr. Murphy, *July 7*, 1006.

King-Harman (Kenagh) Estate, Sales on, Number of, etc.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 449.

Kingston Estate, Purchase of Portion of, by Tenants—Enforcing Landlord's Terms, etc.
Q. Mr. W. Abraham; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 29*, 24.

M'Cartie Estate, Kerry—Proceedings for Recovery of Rent—Takings steps to purchase Estate, etc.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 166–168.

McGillycuddy Estate, Sale of—

Exclusion of certain Tenants.
Qs. Mr. Boland, Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 483–484.

Re-instatement of Evicted Tenant.
Qs. Mr. Murphy; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 793, 794.

O'Brien Estate—Position of negotiations for sale.
Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 776.

Palmer's Estate, Mayo, Purchase of.
Q. Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 477.

Rae Estate, Purchase of, by Congested Districts Board—Present position of negotiations.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 12*, 1366.

Sea, Estates adjoining—Authority responsible for Upkeep of Banks for Tenant Purchasers.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 29*, 27–28.

Sligo, Estates purchased by Congested Districts Board in.
Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 656.

Staff, Strength and Salaries.
Q. Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 997, 998.

Terms Enforced by Landlords—Payment of Hanging Gale, etc.
Qs. Mr. Delany, *July 7*, 1007, 1008; Mr. Wyndham, 1012; Mr. J. Redmond, *July 8*, 1111, 1112; Capt. Donelan, 1113, 1114; Mr. Flynn, 1116; Mr. T. O'Donnell, 1118; Mr. Kilbride, 1122.

[*cont.*

Land Purchase, Ireland—*cont.*
  Untenanted Land, Bonus for.
    Os. Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 998, 999; Mr. Roche, 999; Mr. Hemphill, 1011; Mr. J. Redmond, *July 8*, 1107, 1108; Mr. T. W. Russell, 1127.
  Westropp Estate, Clare.
    Expediting Sale of.
      Q. Mr. Sheehy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 652.
    Land Judge, Action of, in delaying sale of.
      O. Mr. Cullinan, *July 7*, 986.
    Offers to Tenants, etc.
      Qs Mr. Sheehy; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 12*, 1363, 1364.
  Zone System, Abuse of—Steps taken to safeguard interests of Tenants, etc.
    O. Mr. Cullinan, *July 7*, 987, 988.

Lansdowne, Marquess of [*Secretary of State for Foreign affairs*]
  Anderson, Constable — Charges against, and dismissal from the force—Tabling Papers relating to, *July 12*, 1344, 1345.
  "Antillian," ss —Imprisonment of Capt. Wescott at Vera Cruz—Compensation Claim, etc., *July 7*, 926, 927.
  Army Reform Proposals, *July 11*, 1175.
  British Flag, protection afforded by, to persons travelling by sea, *July 12*, 1327.
  Brussels Maritime Conference, Representation of Great Britain at, *July 7*, 929.
  Merchant Shipping Act (1894) Amendment Bill, 2R., *June 30*, 133.
  Militia—Ballot system, revival of, proposed, *July 11*, 1177.
  Transubstantiation, King's Declaration against—Alteration in Form of Oath proposed, *July 1*, 289, 291, 310.

Larne
  Urban District Council, Application from, for increase in number of Councillors.
    Q. Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 797.

Laurie, Lt.-Gen. J. W. [*Pembroke and Haverfordwest*]
  Admiralty Courtyard Gateway, Whitehall—Architectural Screen, Removing Wooden Shutters from, *July 11*, 1208.

Law, Mr. A. B.—*Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade* [Glasgow, Blackfriars]
  Tyneside Tramways and Tramroads Bill, *Con.*, *June 30*, 247, 249, 250, 252, 259.

Law, Mr. H. A. [Donegal, W.]
  Children's Courts, number of, established in Ireland, *July 7*, 962.
  Donegal Homespuns, sale of Inferior Material as, alleged, *July 13*, 1487.
  Macedonia—Schemes for Tithe Reform, *July 13*, 1478.
  Tuberkeen, Dungloe, Evictions at—Application of G. Ward for Re-instatement, *July 4*, 452; *July 7*, 967.

Law Officers of the Crown
  Salaries and Fees of, allowing opportunity for discussing.
    Q. Mr. T. W. Russell; *A.* Mr A. J. Balfour, *July 11*, 1199.

Lawrence, Mr. W. F. [Liverpool, Abercromby]
  Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 72; *July 5*, 745.
  London County Council (General Powers) Bill, *Con.*, *June 29*, 98.

Lawson, Mr. J. G.—*Secretary to the Local Government Board* [York, N.R., Thirsk]
  Motor Cars, speed regulations for, in London, *July 7*, 960.
  Poor Law Children—Barrack School system—Forest Gate School, proposed purchase of, by West Ham Board of Guardians, *July 13*, 1482.

Leagh, Lough
  Land Proprietors' Meeting in District of—Election of Trustees for Drainage Works.
    Q. Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 481-482.

Leamy, Mr. E., [Kildare, N.]
  Leixlip Burial Ground, acquiring additional land for, *July 4*, 451.
  Naas Workhouse—Destruction of Whiskey polluted with impure water—Refunding duty proposed, *July 12*, 1354.

Lee, Mr. A. H., [Hampshire, Fareham]
  Devonport, visit of German Naval Officers to, *July 13*, 1465.
  Rosyth Base—Progress of Works, &c., *July 13*, 1465.

Leek, Caldon Low and Hartington Light Railways Order, 1898.
  Amendment of—Order presented, *July 11*, 1147, 1186.

Leese, Sir J. F. [Lancashire, Accrington.]
  Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *July 13*, 1515.

Legge, Col. H. [St. George's, Hanover Square]
  Army.
    Lances, Decision as to Retention of, *June 30*, 193.
    Quick-firing Guns for the Artillery, Alleged Delay in Provision of, *June 30*, 187.
  London, Port of—Prevalence of Beri-beri—Precautions taken, *June 30*, 147.

Leicestershire and Warwickshire Electric Power Bill
  l. Commons' Amendments, *con.**, *June 30*, 117.

Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill
  l. 3R* *June 30*, 118.
  c. *Con.** *July 5*, 618.

Leith Corporation Tramways Order Confirmation Bill
l. Report from Joint Committee *July 5*, 602.
c. Report from Joint Committee *July 5*, 619.
3R.* *July 7*, 943.
l. 1R.* and 2R.* *July 8*, 1050.

Leixlip
Burial Ground, Acquiring Additional Land for.
Q. Mr. Leamy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 451.

Leng, Sir J. [Dundee]
Hygiene, Teaching of, in Scotch Schools, *July 11*, 1188, 1190.
Licensing Bill Procedure Resolution, *July 1*, 348, 349.
Trade and Commerce — Statistical Abstract (1903) for United Kingdom, Date of Publication, etc., *July 13*, 1478.

Lettir (Kerry)
School—Delay in Producing New Plans, Alleged.
Q. Mr. Boland; Mr. Wyndham, *July 13*, 1484.

Levy, Mr. M. [Leicestershire, Loughborough]
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *July 12*, 1455; *July 13*, 1495.

Lewis, Mr. J. H. [Flint Boroughs]
Licensing Bill.
Com., *June 29*, 51; *July 5*, 733; *July 6*, 843, 845; *July 11*, 1276, 1278; *July 12*, 1445.
Procedure Resolution, *July 4*, 541.

Leyton Urban District Council Bill
l. Report from Attorney-General presented, *July 5*, 601.
2R.* *July 7*, 918.

Licensing Bill
Debates on Closure Resolution [Commons], *July 1*, 320; *July 4*, 488; *July 5*, 659.
Absence of the Prime Minister from Debates, 495, 496, 503, 509, 510.
Allotted Days, Order as to, 330, 488, 554, 660, 726.
Amendments, Number of, 328, 385, 542, 560, 671.
Application of the Closure, Order of, 329–331, 488, 554, 659, 660, 725–727.
Brewers, Pressure brought to bear on the Government by, alleged, 337, 341, 368–370, 381, 382, 510–512, 525, 544, 581, 673, 693.
Business of the House.
Mismanagement of, alleged, 332, 346, 347, 350, 351, 366, 373, 374, 493, 496, 530, 531, 587, 588.
Position of, 326, 373, 583.

Licensing Bill—*cont.*
Committee, Proceedings in—Application of the Closure, 330, 488, 554, 659, 725.
Compartments, Length of, 517, 518.
Confining Operation of the Closure to Report Stage, proposed, 661–664.
Control of the House of Commons over the Executive Government, 529.
Controversial Measures passed in former Sessions without the Closure, etc., 376–378, 683.
Criticism of Details, etc., Time spent on, 323, 325, 331, 334, 361, 385, 491, 540, 560.
Curtailment of Liberties of the House, alleged, 328, 329, 331, 338–341, 359, 380, 387, 508, 537, 539, 555, 563, 566, 567, 580.
Delay in introducing and proceeding with the Bill, 332, 346, 350, 353, 354, 366, 516, 544.
Discussions in Committee, character of, and time occupied by, 333, 334, 339, 344, 345, 354, 355, 361, 362, 374, 375, 379, 380, 561, 572, 669, 695.
Distribution of Parliamentary time, waste of time in obstructing Government measures, etc., 567–570, 584–587.
Duration of Parliament and time granted to the Government for carrying through its legislation, 322, 323, 492, 514, 583–585.
Extension of time for discussion in Committee, proposed, 534, 556, 558, 559, 682–686, 689–692, 694, 695, 697, 699, 700–702, 704–711.
Home Rule Bill precedent, 520, 557, 563, 566, 571, 683, 686–688, 690, 694, 696, 698, 703.
Innovation of constitutional principle and practice, alleged, 338, 339, 358, 360, 490, 505, 506, 562, 563, 577, 589.
Mandate, doctrine of, 335–337, 339, 342, 352, 371.
Method of framing Government Bills, 362, 363, 376.
Motions to Report Progress—Application of the Closure, 331, 660.
New Procedure Rules, Failure of, 505–507.
Notice of Resolution, Precedents for shortness of, 320, 321, 333, 527, 528.
Number and occasion of Guillotine Motions in recent years, 490, 493–495, 502, 503, 513–515, 574.
Opposition to the Bill by all classes of the community, 348–350, 370, 381, 539, 544–546, 561, 583.

[*cont.*

Licensing Bill—*cont.*

- Power and influence of the Government—Necessity for passing the Resolution, etc., 342, 351, 504, 567.
- Principles of the Bill, Necessity for adequate discussion of, etc., 327, 343, 344, 346, 347, 351–353, 357, 359, 361, 364, 365, 367, 368, 376, 384, 497–500, 522, 523, 536, 537, 546–548, 550, 552, 553, 558, 561, 575, 589, 661, 672, 684, 685, 690–692, 698, 701, 705–708, 710.
- Report Stage.
  - Application of Closure, 330, 488, 554, 659, 726.
  - Exemption of, from Operation of Closure, Proposed, 667–676.
- Third Reading, Proceedings on—Application of Closure, 330, 331, 489, 554, 660, 727.
- Wales, Exclusion of, from Operation of the Bill—Discussion as to, Precluded by the Closure, 541.
- c. Com., *June 29*, 35; *July 5*, 727; *July 6*, 809; *July 11*, 1224; *July 12*, 1369; *July 13*, 1494.
- c. Rep. *July 13*, 1605.
- *Debates in Committee* [Commons], *June 29*, 35; *July 5*, 727; *July 6*, 809; *July 11*, 1224; *July 12*, 1369; *July 13*, 1494.
  - Alteration in Present System of Pushing the Sale of Liquor—Introduction of Counter-attractions, etc., Proposed, 1378, 1379, 1382, 1385, 1386, 1392–1394, 1397, 1398.
  - Compensation.
    - "Calculated as if this Act had not Passed," meaning of the words, 1251, 1252, 1260, 1261.
    - Charges in Schedule, Increase in, proposed, 1233, 1234.
    - Definition and Distribution of Amount to be Paid to Different Persons interested in a Licensed House, 1268–1277, 1279–1300, 1303.
    - Fund.
      - Levy of, by Quarter Sessions, 813, 814, 835–838.
      - Provision of, by the Trade, 1241, 1250.
    - Grounds on which Magistrates could Refuse Licences without Compensation — "Misconduct," "Undesirable Practices," "Structural Deficiencies," etc., 35–37, 43–45, 54–57, 59, 60, 64, 65, 68, 69, 76, 78, 110, 728–730, 763–766.
    - Licences Taken Away through no Fault of the Owner, Limiting Compensation to, 43, 44, 56–58, 66, 110.

Licensing Bill—*cont.*

- *Debates in Committee—cont.*
  - Compensation—*cont.*
    - New Schedule (Scale of Deductions), 1597, 1598, 1601.
    - "Right" of Licensees to, 1237, 1238, 1250.
    - Scale of, Excessive and Uncalled for, alleged, 1231, 1232, 1244, 1245, 1248, 1254.
    - Special Considerations in Particular Cases, necessity for observing, 1254, 1255.
    - Small Houses under £50 Annual Value, Limiting to, Proposed, 1225, 1126.
    - Time Limit.
      - Church Leases Precedent, 1246, 1247.
      - Fourteen years with full compensation at expiry of time, proposed, 1229, 1230, 1232–1236, 1238–1243, 1245–1247, 1250, 1253, 1254.
    - Valuation of Licensed Premises for Purposes of, Principle to be Adopted, 1258, 1260–1262.
  - Discussion after Question put according to Closure Resolution, 1443, 1444.
  - Enforcement of the Act and Levy of the Fund—Position of Quarter Sessions, 813, 814, 835–838, 843–846.
  - *Ex parte* Statements made in consultation with the Home Secretary, Question as to, 1557, 1559.
  - Licences.
    - Agreements between Brewery Companies and Landlords, Powers of Magistrates as to, 750–754.
    - Agreements between Landlords and Tenants, Question of Compensation, etc., 1277, 1278, 1296, 1297.
    - *Bona fide* Tenancy, Question as to, 750–752.
    - Bye-laws as to, granting Magistrates Powers of Making, proposed, 42, 47.
    - Committee Composed of Justices of the District and Members of the County Council to deal with, proposed, 863–866.
    - Granting, for fourteen years with full Compensation at Expiry of Time, 1236, 1238–1243, 1245–1247, 1250, 1253, 1254.

[*cont.*

- **Licensing Bill**—*cont.*
  - *Debates—cont.*
    - Licences—*cont.*
      - New.
        - Amount to be paid for, Discretion of Justices as to, 1417–1421, 1423, 1424, 1426, 1429, 1436–1439.
        - Conditions of Granting.
          - Discretion of Magistrates as to, 1417, 1418, 1420-1422, 1424, 1425, 1427, 1428, 1431, 1433–1435. 1437, 1439–1442.
          - "Private Person" and "Monopoly Value," meaning of, 1438, 1441.
          - Quarter Sessions, Powers of, to Sanction or Vary, 1372–1374.
        - Confirmation of, Granting Powers as to, to County Licensing Committee, 1369–1372.
        - Fees for, to be Allocated for Relief of Rates, proposed, 1439, 1440.
        - Local Authorities.
          - Intervention of, in the matter, proposed, 1383–1385, 1387–1393, 1396 – 1398, 1403–1412.
          - Three Weeks' Notice of Hearing of the Application to be given to the Local Authority, Proposed, 1398–1409.
        - Necessity for, to be determined by Magistrates prior to Granting, Proposed, 1376–1378.
        - Refusal of, before 1st Jan., 1907, Proposed, 1374-1376.
        - Representative Authority to express Public Opinion, Introduction of, Proposed, 1378 – 1381, 1383 – 1385, 1391, 1393.
        - Seven Years Limit, 1247–1249, 1417, 1418, 1423–1426, 1428, 1430, 1432, 1433, 1437, 1442.
      - Reduction in.
        - Number Already Reduced by Magistrates, 1259.
        - Sufficient Reduction, Making Compulsory, Proposed, 883–888.

- **Licensing Bill**—*cont.*
  - *Debates—cont.*
    - Licences—*cont.*
      - Refusal of.
        - Authority as to, Vesting, in Justices instead of in Quarter Sessions, Proposed, 819–824.
        - County Areas, Making Joint Police Committee the Authority for Proposed, 827–830.
        - Houses of Insufficient Rateable Value, 100, 101.
        - Transfer of Authority from Local Justices to Quarter Sessions, Objections to, 819–824, 828, 829.
      - Renewal of.
        - Appeal.
          - Local Justices to sit with Quarter Sessions, Proposed, 879, 880.
          - Whole body of Magistrates, to, Proposed, 766, 767, 809.
        - Combination of Reasons for Non-renewal, Discretion of Magistrates as to, 809-814.
        - Grounds on which Renewal could be Refused without Granting Compensation, 35–37, 43–45, 54–57, 59, 60, 64, 65, 68, 69, 76, 78, 110, 728–730, 763–766.
        - "Ill-conducted," Definition of, 38-40, 43, 56, 58, 59, 67, 69–79, 112, 765, 766, 1583, 1584.
        - Incoming and Outgoing Tenants, or Holder of the Licence, Character of, to be taken into consideration, Proposed, 739–742, 759, 760.
        - Magistrates' Powers as to, Crippled by the Bill, 35, 36, 44, 65–72, 75, 102–106, 110, 111, 745, 754.
        - Non-fulfilment of Conditions under which Licence was Granted, 763–766.
        - "Persistent" Omission to Supply suitable Refreshment, Using, as a Ground for Refusal, proposed, 35–38, 40, 41, 45, 46, 1583, 1584.
        - "Reasonable Requirements of the Justices," Refusal to comply with, 102–109, 111, 112, 114.

[*cont*.

Licensing Bill—*cont.*
- *Debates—cont.*
  - Licenses—*cont.*
    - Renewal—*cont.*
      - "Structural Alterations," Discretion of Magistrates as to, 85, 86, 729.
      - "Unsuitable" Premises, Definition of, 87–90, 99, 728–730.
    - Review of, by Local Magistrates and Reports to Quarter Sessions, proposed, 851–858.
    - Security of Tenure, question of, 1247–1249, 1266.
    - Transfer of—Granting power to Magistrates to Refuse Renewals, 733–735.
    - "Undesirable Practices," Definition of, 64, 65, 76, 80.
    - Vested Interests Created by present System, 1236, 1237, 1239, 1249, 1256–1258, 1265, 1266.
  - Licensing Committees.
    - Constitution of, 1574, 1575.
    - Number of, 1539, 1540.
    - Qualifications of Justices, 1540–1542.
    - Rules Governing Appointment of, to be made by Quarter Sessions Subject to Approval of Secretary of State, 1499, 1500.
  - Magistrates.
    - Bye-laws as to Supply of Provisions, etc., Granting Powers as to, proposed, 42, 47.
    - Powers of, Crippled by the Bill, 35, 36, 44, 65–72, 75, 102–106, 110, 111, 745, 754.
  - New Schedule (Scale of Deductions), 1597, 1598, 1601.
  - Non-County Boroughs with a separate Commission of the Peace and a Population of over 25,000, Granting Control of Licensed houses within their Boundaries to, 1500–1520.
  - Police Supervision of licensed premises—Cases in which Supervision is Difficult or Impossible, 51–57, 59, 60.
  - Quarter Sessions.
    - Administrative Areas, Division of, into Districts for the purposes of the Bill, 1449-1452.
    - Authority as to Granting and Renewing Licences Transferred to, from Local Justices, 819–824, 828, 829.
    - Delegation of Powers to a Committee—Revision of Decisions of Committee, etc., 1455, 1456, 1494–1496.

Licensing Bill—*cont.*
- *Debates—cont.*
  - Quarter Sessions—*cont.*
    - Enforcement of the Act, and Levy of the Fund.
      - Local Option as to, Granting, proposed, 843–846, 848.
      - Position of Quarter Sessions, 813, 814, 835–838.
    - Judicial or Administrative Character and Functions of, 865, 869–876.
    - Justices of Districts to Sit with, to hear Appeals, proposed, 879, 880, 1542, 1543.
    - Non-County Boroughs having a Separate Commission of the Peace, Representation of, 1543, 1544.
    - *Personnel* of, Attacks on, 1560–1563.
  - Persons entitled to be heard by Committee of, Representation of, by Counsel or Solicitor, proposed, 1529–1534.
  - Rules for Carrying into Effect of the Act—Powers Conferred on the Home Secretary, Lack of Parliamentary Control, etc., 1545–1570.
  - Time limit, *see under sub-heading* Compensation.
- Allotted days for.
  - *Os.* Sir A. Acland-Hood, Mr. E. Griffith, *July 5*, 768; Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 6*, 807.
- Borough Recorders, Omission from Bill of Provision as to.
  - *Q.* Sir A. Rollit; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 7*, 959.
- Clauses 3 and 4, Submitting, to a Money Committee.
  - *Q.* Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Speaker *July 11*, 1223.
- Date of Taking.
  - *Os.* Sir A. Acland-Hood, *July 8*, 1143; Mr. J. Ellis, Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 12*, 1368.
- Motion of Mr. A. J. Balfour, Giving due Notice of, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Bryce; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 30*, 180–181.
- Penalties for not providing Reasonable Refreshment—Complying with Requirements of Magistrates.
  - *Q.* Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 11*, 1220.
- Position of, on the Order Paper.
  - *Os.* Mr. S. Buxton, Sir A. Acland-Hood, *July 11*, 1321.
- Value of Premises Involved, etc.
  - *Qs.* Mr. C. Wason; *As.* Mr. A. Douglas, *June 30*, 162-163; *July 4*, 469–470.

Light Railways
- Act of 1896—Orders of Commissioners, Presented, *July 11*, 1147, 1186.

Light Railways Bill
l. 3R.* *July 8*, 1055.

Limerick
Post Office—Increasing Postmen's Pay, Proposed.
Qs. Mr. Joyce ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 7*, 974.

Liquor Licensing, etc.
Licensed Premises.
Probate, Valuation for, Particulars as to.
Q. Mr. Corbett ; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *June 29*, 7–8.
Value, Average Annual, of 1869 Licensed Houses, etc.
Q. Sir E. Sassoon ; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 4*, 447–448.

Listellick Farm, Kerry
Purchase of, by Congested Districts Board.
O. Mr. T. O'Donnell ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 169.

Liverpool and Wigan Churches Bill
c. Rep.* *July 7*, 943.
3R.* *July 11*, 1181.

Llanelly Harbour Bill
c. *Con.** *July 11*, 1181.

Lloyd-George, Mr. D. [Carnarvon Boroughs]
Divisions—Members personally or pecuniarily interested in, Liability of, to have vote struck off, *July 6*, 903, 909, 910 ; *July 11*, 1303, 1306.
Licensing Bill.
Com., *June 29*, 41, 73, 105, 106 ; *July 5*, 752, 754 ; *July 11*, 1271, 1298, 1300, 1303, 1306 ; *July 12*, 1371, 1372, 1384, 1398, 1400, 1406, 1419 ; *July 13*, 1504, 1505, 1532, 1544, 1545.
Procedure Resolution, *July 4*, 520, 522, 525 ; *July 5*, 661, 675, 704, 705.
Transvaal, Importation of Chinese Labour to—Number of Men, Women and Children imported, *June 29*, 16.

Loan Fund Banks, Ireland
Debenture Holders of, Refunding Money lost by.
Q. Dr. Thompson ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 11*, 1193.

Local Government Board
President—Rt. Hon. W. H. Long.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill
c. Rep.* *July 4*, 439.
*Con.** *July 8*, 1085.
3R.* *July 11*, 1182.
l. 1R.* *July 12*, 1325.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill
c. Rep.* *July 13*, 1457.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill
c. Rep.* *July 5*, 619.
*Con.** *July 8*, 1085.
3R.* *July 11*, 1182.
l. 1R.* *July 12*, 1325.

Loch Leven Water Power Bill
c. Rep.* *July 5*, 619.
*Con.** and 3R.* *July 11*, 1181, 1182.
l. 1R.* *July 11*, 1145.

Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. [Essex, Epping]
Licensing Bill.
Com., *July 13*, 1494.
Procedure Resolution, *July 4*, 558.

London
Motor Cars, Speed regulations for.
Q. Mr. C. Wason ; *A.* Mr. G. Lawson, *July 7*, 960.
Port of — Prevalence of Beri-beri—Precautions taken.
Q. Col. Legge ; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *June 30*, 147.
Small Arms Factory—Number of Rifles manufactured and Cost per Head 1889–1894.
Q. Mr. Shackleton ; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 11*, 1196–1197.

London and North Western Railway Bill
c. Lords' Amendments, *Con.** *July 1*, 315.

London Assurance Company
Crown Agent as Director of—Breach of Civil Service Regulations.
Os. Earl of Portsmouth, *July 12*, 1329, 1330 ; Duke of Marlborough, 1331, 1332.

London County Council (General Powers) Bill
c. *Con.* *June 29*, 90.
3R.* *July 1*, 315.
l. 1R* *July 1*, 266.
Debate on consideration (Commons) *June 29*, 90.
Lodging Houses, Catering for, by London County Council, 96–99.
Verminous Houses, Cleansing of.
Act of 1891, Powers of Magistrates under — Retention proposed, 91, 93, 95.
Medical Officers, Authorisation of, to order Repairs, etc., 91, 93.

London County Council (Money) Bill
l. 3R.* *July 4*, 389.
c. Lords' Amendts. *Con.** *July 8*, 1085.

London Port and Docks Bill
c. Bill withdrawn, *July 11*, 1182.

London United Tramways Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *July 5*, 601.
Rep.* *July 11*, 1145.

Londonderry
Magee College — Number of Candidates passing B.A. Examination at Royal University (1899-1903).
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 13*, 1460-1462, 1482.
Telephone Service to Ballymena, Establishing.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 29*, 6.

Londonderry, Marquess of—*Lord President of the Council and President of the Board of Education*
Education (Transferred Schools) Bill, 2R., *July 4*, 399, 403, 406, 426, 429, 430.
Grants, Change in System of, by Article 31 of Code for 1904—Loss entailed on Local Education Authorities, etc., *July 12*, 1340-1342.
Great Eastern Railway Bill—Agreement as to Conveyance of Post Office Servants and Mails by Motor Cars, *July 8*, 1051.
Pupil Teachers, Training of—New Regulations, Increased Grants, etc., *July 7*, 932-936.

Long, Rt. Hon. W. H.—*President of the Local Government Board* [Bristol, S.]
Adulteration of Food and Drugs—Recommendations of Commission of Inquiry—Appointment of Expert Officer, *July 6*, 774.
Gosberton—Land for Allotments, Purchase of, Refusal to Sanction Loan for, *July 4*, 447.
Infant Mortality, High Rate of—Issuing of Circular as to encouraging Poor People to apply for early Medical Relief, etc., *July 11*, 1192-1193.
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *July 6*, 864, 865.
London, Port of—Prevalence of Beri-beri—Precautions taken, *June 30*, 147.
Meat, Inspection of, for tuberculosis—Qualifications of Inspectors, etc., *July 12*, 1359, 1360.
Poor Law Medical Relief, Outdoor, in the Metropolis, arrangements for—Report proposed, *July 6*, 774.
Tuberculosis in Animals—Model Bye-laws, Number of Local Authorities adopting, means of enforcing adoption, etc., *July 12*, 1358, 1359.
Urban District Councils—Chairman's Power of Voting, *July 5*, 622.
Vaccination—Calf Lymph, Cost of procuring—Disposal of Calves, etc., *July 5*, 644-645.

Longford
Drainage of Tributary from Mullagharowmeen to Cambin River.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 631-632.

Longford—*cont.*
Infirmary Committee—Refusal to take urgent Military Cases during Closure of Military Hospital.
Q. Sir C. Rasch; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *July 11*, 1217-1218.
Paupers, English and Scotch, deported to, *Q.* Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 632.

Lonsdale, Earl of
Yeomanry, Arming of, deficiencies in—Objections to the bayonet, etc., *July 5*, 610.

Lonsdale, Mr. J. B. [Armagh, Mid]
Constabulary — Constable Anderson, Charges against, Discussion of, Arrangement made with Chief Unionist Whip as to, *July 7*, 1040, 1041.
Land (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 8*, 1119.
Land Judge's Court, Congestion in—Sitting during Long Vacation, proposed, *July 7*, 1014.

Lord Advocate for Scotland
Mr. C. Scott Dickson.

Lord Chamberlain
Residence of, Expenditure in connection with repairs to.
O. Mr. J. Burns, *June 30*, 231.

Lord Chancellor—*Earl of Halsbury.*

Lord Chancellor of Ireland
Lord Ashbourne.

Lord Chief Justice
Lord Alverstone.

Lord Great Chamberlain
Marquess of Cholmondeley.

Lord Justice-General of Scotland
Lord Kinross.

Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland
Earl of Dudley.

Lord President of the Privy Council
Marquess of Londonderry.

Lord Privy Seal
Marquess of Salisbury.

Lord Tredegar's Supplemental Estate Bill
c. 2R.* *July 11*, 1182.

Lottery Circulars
Postage of Foreign Circulars in Great Britain, Prevention of.
Q. Sir T. Dewar; *A.* Earl Percy, *July 4*, 468-469.

Lough, Mr. T. [Islington, W.]
- Customs and Excise — Removals from Bond, Revenue derived from additional Duty on, *July 13*, 1466.
- Forest Gate Barrack School, proposed purchase of, by West Ham Board of Guardians, alleged, *July 13*, 1481, 1482.
- Licensing Bill.
  - *Com.*, *June 29*, 36; *July 12*, 1436, 1443, 1444; *July 13*, 1570.
  - Discussion after Question put according to Closure Resolution, *July 12*, 1443, 1444.
  - Procedure Resolution, *July 1*, 345; *July 5*, 696.
- Nigeria, Northern—Increased Expenditure —Question of Reduction, etc., *June 30*, 159.
- Port of London Bill, Opposition to, *July 11*, 1223.
- Taxation—Ireland, Cost of Collection in, Details of, *July 5*, 623.
- Tibet Expedition.
  - Information as to, *July 7*, 955, 956.
  - Progress of Negotiations, character of Expedition, Government Policy, etc., *July 6*, 916.
- Transvaal, Importation of Chinese Labour to—Sunday Work, Regulations as to, *July 6*, 786.

Lovat, Lord
- Army—Staff Officers, Deficiency in number of—Granting increased facilities for qualifying, etc., proposed, *July 8*, 1060-1064.

Lovat Scouts
- Armament, position, etc.—Postponement of Motion of Earl of Wemyss.
  - *O.* Earl of Wemyss, *July 4*, 392.

Lowestoft
- Light Railway—Transfer of Powers to Mayor, Aldermen, etc.—Order presented, *July 11*, 1147, 1186.

Lowther, Mr. C. N. W. [Cumberland, Eskdale]
- Solway Fishery Bill, Date of Introducing, *July 4*, 470.

Lowther, Rt. Hon. J. W.—*Chairman of Committees* [Cumberland, Penrith]
- (*for* rulings as Chairman, *see title* Chairman)

Lloyd, Mr. A. K. [Berkshire, Abingdon]
- Agriculture, Board of—Leaflets 7, 17, 37, 59 and 71, Reprinting, *July 5*, 645-646.

Lucas, Mr. R. J. [Portsmouth]
- Navy—Training Ships—"St. Vincent," discontinuing Training on, *July 11*, 1191.

Ludgate Circus
- Post Office, Hours of Duty at.
  - *Q.* Mr. Horner; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Jul* 7, 949.

Lunatic Asylums
- Ballinasloe, *see under that title.*

Lunatics
- Aliens within the Metropolitan Area.
  - *Q.* Sir W. Greene; *A.* Mr. Cochrane *July 11*, 1207.
- Commissioners in Lunacy, Report of, Pre sented, *June 29*, 5; *June 30*, 120 *July 11*, 1147, 1187.

Lundon, Mr. W. [Limerick, E.]
- Butter, Irish Salt Firkin—Number o Prosecutions for excessive moisture *July 13*, 1487.
- Carnane Estate, Sale of, proposed, *July 7* 962.
- Tuberculosis in Animals.
  - Bye-laws, Model—Number of Loca Authorities adopting, Means o enforcing Adoption, etc., *July 1* 1358.
  - Meat, Inspection of, for Tuberculosi —Qualifications of Inspectors, etc. *July 12*, 1359.

Lurgan
- Victoria Street National School—Salary o Teacher—Loss of Income alleged.
  - *Q.* Col. Saunderson; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 13*, 1467-1469.

Lyell, Mr. [Dorsetshire, E.]
- Navy—Chaplain and Instructor, combining Offices of, *June 30*, 145.

Lymph
- Calves, Cost of Procuring from—Disposal of Calves—"Lymph Veal," etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *July 5*, 644-645.

Lytham Improvement Bill
- *l.* Rep.* *July 8*, 1049.

Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred—*Secretary of State for the Colonies* [Warwick and Leamington]
- Africa, South.
  - Boers, Repatriation of, Expenditure on.
    - Administration of Loan, Cost of, *July 6*, 787.
    - Detailed Statement proposed, *July 6*, 786.
  - Constabulary, Strength of, *June 29*, 17; *July 6*, 785.
  - Milner, Lord, Conspiracy to Murder, Arrests, etc., *June 30*, 156.
  - Railways, Administration of, Resolutions of Inter-Colonial Council as to, etc., *July 5*, 635.
  - Transvaal, *see that subheading.*

[*cont.*

Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred—*cont.*
- Australia—Import Duty on Magazines—Alleged Notification by Commonwealth Government, *July 6*, 780, 781
- Canada, Fenian Raids in, Medals Granted for Services in Repelling, *July 6*, 780.
- Cape Colony—Chinese Exclusion Bill, Delay in Crown Assent to, *July 4*, 465 ; *July 11*, 1202.
- Ceylon—Crime, Punishment of—Substitution of Transportation for Capital Punishment, proposed, *July 13*, 1473.
- Malay Peninsula Railway, Construction of—Convention with Sultan of Johore, *July 13*, 1474.
- Malta.
  - Balance Sheet of Government, tabling—Surplus Revenue, etc., *July 4*, 454, 466 ; *July 7*, 955 ; *July 12*, 1357.
  - Charities and Hospitals, Government Expenditure on, etc., *June 30*, 158.
- Natal.
  - Immigration Act (1903), Alleged Infringement of, by the "Tweeddale"—Steps to be Taken, *July 4*, 463–464.
  - Indians in, Suicide among, *June 30*, 158.
- Nigeria, Northern.
  - Expenditure, increased—Question of Reduction, etc., *June 30*, 159.
  - Military Operations, Information as to, *July 13*, 1473.
- Transvaal.
  - British Indians, Trading Privileges of.
    - Colonial Restrictive Legislation projected, etc., *July 8*, 1094.
    - Supreme Court, Decision of, alleged Statement of Sir A. Lawley as to, etc., *June 30*, 156.
  - Census, tabling Summary of—Dutch and English in Pretoria and Johannesburg, etc., *July 4*, 454.
  - Chinese Labour, Importation of.
    - Beri-beri, Outbreak of.
      - Cause and Extent—Date of Outbreak, etc., *June 29*, 14, 15.
      - Delay in receiving Despatches from Lord Milner, *June 30*, 156.
      - Telegrams to Lord Milner, Number and Dates of, *July 4*, 464–465.
      - "Tweeddale," the, Suggested Discharge of, from Service, *July 4*, 464.
    - Close Time for Admission of Coolies—Limiting Numbers, *July 4*, 462.

Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred—*cont.*
- Transvaal—*cont.*
  - Chinese Labour—*cont.*
    - Contract, tabling Terms of, *July 4*, 462.
    - Durban.
      - Confining Labourers in Compounds at, Authority for, *July 4*, 460, 461.
      - Landing Coolies at—Lord Milner's Report, *June 29*, 15–16 ; *July 13*, 1477.
    - Escape and Capture of two Coolies, alleged, *July 8*, 1144 ; *July 11*, 1203, 1323 ; *July 13*, 1476.
    - Number of Men, Women, and Children imported, *June 29*, 16 ; *July 4*, 459, 460 ; *July 7*, 955.
    - Recruiting in China.
      - Advertisements in *Chinese Times*, False Impression given by—Authority responsible, etc., *June 29*, 13.
      - Contravention of Treaty—Prohibiting Recruiting at Canton, *July 4*, 459 ; *July 11*, 1192.
      - Hong-Kong, Protection of Coolies embarked at, *July 4*, 462.
      - Tientsin, Disturbances at—Preventing Future Disturbances, *July 11*, 1198–1199.
    - Sunday Work, Regulations as to, *July 6*, 785, 786.
    - "Tweeddale," Debarkation of Coolies from, tabling Report of, *July 4*, 463.
    - Unskilled Labour, Confining Chinese to—Comet Mine Overseers, *July 11*, 1202.
  - Constabulary, South African—Strength, cost, Transvaal Contributions, etc., *June 29*, 17 ; *July 6*, 785.
  - Explosives Tax—Saving in 1903 as compared with 1899, etc., *July 5*, 638.
  - Finance, Debate on, tabling Proceedings of Inter-Colonial Council Previous to, etc., *July 5*, 639, 640.
  - Labour Question.
    - Chinese Labour, importation of, *see subheading* Transvaal—Chinese Labour.
    - Native Labour in Mines.
      - Comparison with numbers of white labourers, *July* 12, 1356.

[*cont.*

Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred—*cont.*
- Transvaal—*cont.*
  - Labour Question—*cont.*
    - Native Labour in Mines—*cont.*
      - Statistics for March, April, May, 1904, *June 30*, 153; *July 4*, 457.
    - White labour in Mines.
      - Comparison of, with coloured, *July 12*, 1356.
      - Statistics for April, 1904, *June 29*, 10.
  - Legislative Council.
    - Changes in Constitution, proposed, *July 5*, 639.
    - Names of Members with Official Positions or Avocations, etc., *July 4*, 456.
  - Mines.
    - Gold output, *July 12*, 1356.
    - Johannesburg, Kaffir Compounds at, Police Raid on, *June 30*, 153.
  - Native Affairs, Administration of—Reduction in number of Native Commissioners, etc., *July 13*, 1477.
  - Representative Government, Communications as to Grant of, *July 4*, 465.

Lytton, Earl of
- Hall Marking of Foreign Plate Bill, 2R., *July 5*, 604.

McArthur, Mr. C. [Liverpool, Exchange]
- Brussels—International Maritime Conference, Refusal of Great Britain to be officially represented at—Reason, *July 4*, 468.
- Tobacco Duties on Strips, etc., Date of resumption of debate on, *July 5*, 626–627; *July 6*, 804.

M'Cartie Estate, Kerry
- Rent, Proceedings for Recovery of—Taking steps to purchase Estate, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 166–168.

McCrae, Mr. G. [Edinburgh, East]
- Finance Bill, Date of proceeding with, *July 5*, 642.

Macedonia
- Gendarmerie, Re-organisation of.
  - European Officers, Duties of—Hilmi Pacha's Circular.
    - *Q.* Mr. C. Allen; *A.* Earl Percy, *July 6*, 789.
  - Muerzteg Agreement, Exclusion of Mutessarifliks of Selfidge and Koritza from.
    - *Q.* Mr. Moon; *A.* Earl Percy, *June 29*, 7.

Macedonia—*cont.*
- Removal of Inhabitants to other parts of European Turkey, Cancelling prohibition against.
  - *Q.* Mr. Moon; *A.* Earl Percy, *June 30*, 144.
- Tithe Reform, Schemes for.
  - *Q.* Mr. H. Law; *A.* Earl Percy, *July 13*, 1478.

McFadden, Mr. E. [Donegal, E.]
- Ballinascarthy and Timoleague Light Railway—County Guarantee of Company, levying Rate for Dividend on, *July 5*, 631.
- Burtonport Railway.
  - Agreement for making, Alleged changes made by Solicitor in—Publishing Correspondence, etc., *July 5*, 630–631.
  - Gross Earnings per Mile per Week, etc., *June 30*, 148–149.
- Donegal Railway—Through Bookings of Goods to and from Ballybofry, *June 30*, 150–151.
- Strabane Labourers' Cottages Scheme—Case of Henry McCool, *July 12*, 1365.

McGillycuddy Estate
- Sale of.
  - Exclusion of certain Tenants.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Boland, Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 483–484.
  - Reinstatement of evicted Tenant.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Murphy; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 793, 794.

M'Hugh, Mr. P. A. [Leitrim, N.]
- Ballynaclosha National School—Income of Principal Teacher, *July 5*, 630.
- Constabulary, Royal Irish, Punishment of—Number punished at instance of County Inspector Ball, *July 12*, 1351.
- Kilrusheightey, Principal Teacher of, Income of, etc., *July 5*, 646–648; *July 12*, 1360.
- National School Teachers, Contributions by, to Upkeep of Schools 1900–1904, Granting Return showing, *July 5*, 630.

MacIver, Mr. D. [Liverpool, Kirkdale]
- Licensing Bill Procedure Resolution, *July 5*, 661, 662, 674.

McKean, Mr. J. [Monaghan, S.]
- Castleblayney Union, Labourers' Cottages in—Arbitrator's Award for Land—Alleged interested Decision, etc., *June 29*, 25–26.

McKenna, Mr. R. [Monmouth, N.]
- Expenditure (1903-4), Particulars as to, *July 13*, 1465.
- Licensing Bill.
  - *Com.*, *June 29*, 57 ; *July 6*, 819.
  - Procedure Resolution, *July 5*, 671, 692.
- Raglan Castle, Abolishing Charges for photographing, *June 30*, 146–147.

McKillop, Mr. W. [Sligo, N.]
- Spirit Distillation in England — Total Quantity distilled 1903, etc., *July 5*, 641.

Macnamara, Dr. T. J. [Camberwell, N.]
- Borstal Prison—Attack on Warders, conduct of Prison, etc., *July 13*, 1479.
- Education.
  - Grants, New Regulations as to—Hardship to country schools, alleged, *July 6*, 792.
  - Scotland, Favouritism shown to, alleged, *July 13*, 1491.
- Licensing Bill.
  - *Com.*, *July 11*, 1281 ; *July 13*, 1496.
  - Procedure Resolution, *July 1*, 345 ; *July 4*, 570 ; *July 5*, 669, 682, 684.
- Transvaal.
  - Administration—Treatment as "Self-governing" Colony, etc., *July 13*, 1489, 1490.
  - Chinese Labour, Importation of.
    - Beri-beri, Outbreak of.
      - Date of Lord Milner's Depatch, *June 29*, 14, 15.
      - Telegrams to Lord Milner, Number and Dates of, *July 4*, 464.
    - Durban, Landing Coolies at—Lord Milner's Report, *June 29*, 15 ; *July 13*, 1477.
    - Escape and Capture of Two Coolies, Alleged, *July 13*, 1476.
    - Number of Men, Women and Children Imported, *June 29*, 16, 17 ; *July 4*, 459-460.
    - "Tweeddale," Debarkation of Coolies from, Tabling Report of, *July 4*, 462.
  - Mines.
    - Gold Output, Proportion of White and Coloured Labour Employed, etc., *July 12*, 1356.
    - Johannesburg, Kaffir Compounds at, Police Raid on, *June 30*, 152–153.

MacNeill, Mr. S. [Donegal, S.]
- Agricultural Department—Vice-President, Position of, as Member of the Government and House of Commons, etc., *June 30*, 178–179.
- Birthday Honours List—Official Announcement as Prime Minister's List, Precedent for, *June 30*, 177–178.
- British Museum, Disposal of Bronze Lions removed from Railings of, *July 6*, 773.
- Burlington House, Colonnade Removed from—Re-erection Proposed, *July 6*, 773.
- Cape Colony—Chinese Exclusion Bill, Delay in Assenting to, Reason of, *July 4*, 465 ; *July 11*, 1202,
- Chatham Military Railway—Reason for Suspension of Work—Cost of Work done, etc., *July 5*, 636-637.
- Defence of the Empire, Committee of—Participation of Lord Curzon in Proceedings of, *July 6*, 805.
- Divisions—Members Personally or Pecuniarily Interested in—Procedure as to Objections to Votes, *July 6*, 903.
- Muir Bay, Trawling in, Within Prohibited Area, alleged—Date of Visit of the "Granuaile," etc., *July 6*, 799.
- Navy, Flogging in.
  - Birches, Keeping Official Patterns of, in Dockyards—Allowing Inspection by Members, *July 5*, 635, 636.
  - Cat o' nine Tails, suggested Abolition of, *July 4*, 457-458.
  - Statistics as to—Granting Summary of Daily Records, *July 5*, 636.
- Parliament, Dissolution of, non-appearance of Question of, alleged, *July 7*, 981.
- Rathmines Commissioners, Appeal of, against Dublin County Council—Advice of Law Officers of the Crown, *July 4*, 472 ; *July 7*, 798, 799.
- Tibet Expedition—Progress of negotiations, character of the expedition, Government policy, &c., *July 6*, 914.
- Transvaal, Importation of Chinese Labour to—
  - Escape and Capture of two coolies alleged, *July 8*, 1143, 1144 ; *July 11*, 1202, 1203, 1321, 1322 ; *July 13*, 1477.
  - Recruiting in China—Disturbances at Tientsin—Preventing Future Disturbances, *July 11*, 1198.
- Trinity College, Dublin—Administration, method of Government, Revenue, &c., Return as to, proposed, *July 7*, 974 976.

Mac Veagh, Mr. J. [Down, S.]

Alcohol for Manufacturing purposes—Source of supply, extent of German trade, &c., *July 6*, 790, 791.

Belfast.

Queen's College.

Pavement and Organ, cost of. *July 13*, 1482.

Scholarships, Lapsed — Number, cause of lapse, etc., *July 13*, 1482.

Session, Duration of—Appointments held by professors—Abandonment of certain lectures, etc., *July 12*, 1362, 1363.

Clerks of the Peace of Antrim and Belfast, amalgamating offices of—Saving effected, etc., *July 5*, 652.

Coleraine, Publican at, alleged Police Persecution of, *June 30*, 169.

Constabulary—Constable Molloy, conduct of, at Coleraine Petty Sessions—Date of reporting to Inspector General, *July 5*, 652 ; *July 7*, 966.

Greencastle Police Force, Re-instating Sergeant Gallagher in Charge of, *July* 5, 653, 654.

Mayo Harbour Works, Government Advance for, etc., *July 4*, 480.

Moy, Tyrone—Nationalist Demostration —Allowing Procession to proceed by Road from Trew to Moy Station, *July 11*, 1212.

National School Teachers—Down County, Principal Teacher of, Claim of, to Increment of Salary, *July 4*, 450.

Queen's Colleges (*see also subheading* Belfast).

Bachelor of Arts Degree, Number of Candidates Passing Examinations from 1899–1903, *July 13*, 1460–1461, 1482.

Session, Duration of, etc., *July 12*, 1362, 1363.

University Education, Granting Return as to, *July 4*, 480.

Whiskey.

Bonded—Official Knowledge of Contents of Casks, &c., *July 13*, 1481.

Distinguishing Between Pot Still and Patent Still Spirit in Annual Revenue Return, proposed, *July 13*, 1480, 1481.

Magherafelt, Derry

Salters' Company's Trust, Administration of—Holding Local Inquiry.
Qs. Mr. J. Devlin ; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 11*, 1214-1215 ; *July 13*, 1488.

Magistrates and Justices of the Peace

Ireland—Miltown Malbay, Election of Petty Sessions Clerk—Attendance of Magistrates, Validity of Votes, etc.
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 968, 969.

Maidenhead Bridge Bill

c. *Con.* July 5*, 618.
3R.* *July 8*, 1085.
l. Commons' Amendments, *con.* July 11*, 1146.

Malay Peninsula

Railway Construction—Convention with Sultan of Johore, etc.
Q. Mr. H. Heaton ;*A.* Mr. Lyttelton *July 13*, 1473, 1474.

Malcolm, Mr. I. Z. [Suffolk, Stowmarket]

Licensing Bill Procedure Resolution, *July 5*, 706.

Malta

Balance Sheet of Government, Tabling—Surplus Revenue, etc.
Qs. Mr. Boland ; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 4*, 453-454, 466 ; *July 7*, 955 ; *July 12*, 1357.

Charities and Hospitals, Government Expenditure on, etc.
Q. Mr. Boland ; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 30*, 158.

Manchester Corporation (General Powers) Bill

l. 3R.* *June 30*, 117.
c. 1R.* *June 30*, 139.
2R.* *July 11*, 1182.

Manchester Corporation (Tramways) Bill

c. 2R.* *July 11*, 1182.

Manchester Ship Canal (Finance Bill)

c. 3R.* *June 29*, 1.

Marine Works (Ireland) Bill

Introduction of, proposed.
Os. Sir T. Esmonde ; Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 1025.

Mansfield, Mr. H. [Lincolnshire, Spalding]

Education—Scotch System, Introduction of, in England and Wales proposed, *July 13*, 1491.

Licensing Bill, *Com. July 12*, 1372.

Telegraph Service—Appointment of Messengers in rural offices, *July 13*, 1463.

Maritime Causes

Registrar, Order in Council appointing, presented, *June 30*, 120, 141.

Markham, Mr. A. B. [Nottinghamshire, Mansfield]

Coinage minted for the Colonies—Commission paid to Crown Agents, *July 13*, 1480.

[*cont.*

Markham, Mr. A. B.—*cont.*
- Electricity in Mines—Recommendations of Committee, etc., *July 7*, 945, 946.
- Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 77, 80, 89; *July 6*, 887; *July 11*, 1261, 1262.
- South African War—Farm Burning—Return proposed, *July 6*, 786.
- *Times, The*—Supply of copies to Government Departments, *June 29*, 5.
- Transvaal.
  - Administration of—Treatment as self-governing Colony, *July 13*, 1490.
  - Chinese Labour, Importation of.
    - Sunday work, Regulations as to, *July 6*, 786.
    - Unskilled Labour, confining Chinese to—Comet Mine Overseers, *July 11*, 1201.
  - Explosives Tax—Saving in 1903 as compared with 1899, etc., *July 5*, 638.

Marlborough, Duke of [*Parliamentary Secretary for the Colonies*]
- Africa, South, Freights to, increase in, owing to operations of the Shipping Ring, etc., *July 12*, 1333-1335.
- British India Steam Navigation Company—Agreement with the Conference lines, *July 12*, 1332, 1333.
- Crown Agents.
  - Directorships of Companies, Civil Service Regulations as to Holding, *July 12*, 1331, 1332.
  - Goods Shipped to South Africa by—Names of Firms Employed, Rate of Freights Paid, etc., *July 12*, 1336, 1337.
- Transvaal, Importation of Chinese Labour to—Wives and Children, Facilities for Introduction of, Number Registered, etc., *July 5*, 617.

Married Women's Property Act (1882) Amendment Bill
- *c.* 1R.* *July 11*, 1224.

Maryborough
- Gun of Mr. P. Dowling, Confiscation of, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Delaney; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 654.

Matlock and District Gas Bill
- *c.* 3R.* *June 30*, 137.
- *l.* Commons' Amendments, *Con.** *July 4*, 389.

Mayo
- Harbour Works, Government Advances for.
  - *Qs.* Mr. C. Craig, Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 479–480.

Meat
- Inspection of—Tuberculosis, Detection of—Qualifications of Inspectors of Carcases, etc.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Lundon, Mr. Kilbride; *As.* Mr. W. Long, *July 12*, 1359, 1360.

Medical Relief
- *see under* Poor Law.

Medical Services
- Police, Requisitioned by, Fees Paid for.
  - *Q.* Dr. Ambrose; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 5*, 625-626.

Meldreth and Melbourn District Gas and Water Provisional Order
- Report by Board of Trade as to Dispensing with Consent of certain Bodies Presented, *July 13*, 1459.

Melrose District Water Order Confirmation Bill.
- *c.* *Con.** *July 1*, 315.
- 3R.* *July 4*, 439.
- *l.* 1R.* and 2R.* *July 5*, 602.

Members of Parliament
- Free Passage to and from the House—Question of Privilege—Interpretation of Sessional Order No. 11.
  - *Os.* Mr. L. Sinclair, Mr. Speaker, *July 6*, 807–809.

Merchant Shipping
- Africa, South, Freights to, Increase in, Owing to operations of Shipping Ring—Effect on British Shipping Trade, etc.
  - *Os.* Earl of Portsmouth, *July 12*, 1330, 1331, 1334; Duke of Marlborough, 1333-1335.
- "Allanton," Seizure of—Reasons for Confiscation of Cargo by Russian Prize Court, etc.
  - *Qs.* Sir C. Cayzer, Mr. Wolff, Mr. J. Devlin; *As.* Earl Percy, *July 7*, 956.
- "Antillian," S.S.—Imprisonment of Capt. Wescott at Vera Cruz by Order of the Mexican Government—Compensation Claim, Steps taken by H. M. Government to Enforce, etc.
  - *Os.* Lord Muskerry, *July 7*, 923; Marquess of Lansdowne, 926, 927.
- British Flag, Protection Afforded by, to Persons Travelling.
  - *Q.* Lord Muskerry; *A.* Marquess of Lansdowne, *July 12*, 1327.
- British India Steam Navigation Company, Agreement with the Conference Lines,
  - *Os.* Earl of Portsmouth, *July 12*, 1329; Duke of Marlborough, 1332, 1333; Earl Grey, 1333, 1338, 1339.
- Brussels Maritime Conference, Representation of Great Britain at—Deputation from Shipping Associations, etc.
  - *Os.* Lord Muskerry, *July 7*, 927; Marquess of Lansdowne, 929.

Merchant Shipping—*cont.*

Charities available for Seamen, Number, Administration, etc., of—Return proposed.
Os. Lord Muskerry, *July 1*, 267; Lord Wolverton, 268.

Foreign Sailors on British Ships—The "Southern Cross"—Proposed Government Action.
Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *June 30*, 161–162.

"Homewood," Alleged Mutiny on—Composition of Crew.
Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 12*, 1357, 1358.

Independent Lines, Lack of Government Support for.
Os. Duke of Marlborough, *July 12*, 1337; Earl Grey, 1338, 1339.

Squadron of Warships, Board of Trade Warning as to Danger in Approaching.
Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 11*, 1205–1206.

Merchant Shipping Act (1894) Amendment Bill

l. 2R., *June 30*, 122.

Debate on Second Reading [Lords] *June 30*, 122.

Deck Cargoes of a dangerous character carried in winter time.

Anomalies of the Law as to, 122, 123, 129, 130, 134, 136.

Discretion of Ship Masters, fallacy of, 127, 128, 132.

Loss of life due to—Instances and Statistics, 123, 126, 129-131, 133.

Foreign Competition—Undesirability of placing restrictions on British Shipping, 129, 131–136.

Merchant Shipping Bill

l. Rep.*, *June 30*, 137.
3R., *July 7*, 921.

Metropolitan District Railway Bill

c. Rep*, *June 29*, 2.

Metropolitan Police

Dublin—Reason for not promoting Constable T. Whyte.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 165.

Mexico

Wescott, Capt., Imprisonment of, at Vera Cruz—Compensation Claim, Steps taken by H.M. Government to enforce, etc.
Os. Lord Muskerry, *July 7*, 923; Marquess of Lansdowne, 926, 927.

Middlemore, Mr. J. T. [Birmingham, N.]

Licensing Bill.

Com., June 29, 75.

Procedure Resolution, *July 4*, 526, 527; *July 5*, 664.

Militia

Army Reform Proposals, Attitude of, towards the Militia.
Os. Earl of Wemyss, *July 11*, 1155, 1156, 1178; Vis. Hardinge, 1162; Earl of Donoughmore, 1166; Earl Spencer, 1172; Marquess of Lansdowne, 1175.

Artillery.

Field Guns, date of Supplying.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *June 30*, 182; Mr. Arnold Forster, 185; Sir J. Colomb, 186.

Mobilisation—Estimated Cost of Conveyance from the North to Portsmouth.
Q. Sir J. Colomb; *A.* Mr. Arnold Forster, *July 6*, 778, 779.

Training—Guns and Appliances in use at Local Headquarters.
Q. Sir J. Colomb; *A.* Mr Arnold Forster, *July 6* 779.

Ballot System, Advantages of, Revival of, proposed.
Os. Earl of Wemyss, *July 11*, 1149 1151, 1155, 1178, 1179; Vis. Hardinge, 1162; Earl Bathurst Lord Rosmead, 1165; Earl of Donoughmore, 1169–1172 Marquess of Lansdowne, 1177.

Compulsory Service, Recommendations of Norfolk Commission as to.
Os. Earl of Wemyss, *July 11*, 1150 1152, 1154; Lord Newton, 1159; Vis. Hardinge, 1162–1164; Earl Bathurst, 1165.

Constitutional Basis of Existing Military System.
O. Earl of Wemyss, *July 11*, 1148, 1149, 1157.

Hill, William, Death of, through Ball Cartridge being served out instead of dummy, for practice.
Qs. Mr. Coghill; *As.* Mr. B. Davenport, *June 30*, 154; *July 7*, 954, 955.

Mobilisation—Conveyance from the North to Portsmouth, Estimated Cost of.
Q. Sir. J. Colomb; *A.* Mr. Arnold Forster, *July 6*, 778, 779.

Norfolk Commission, Report and Recommendations of.
O. Earl of Wemyss, *July 11*, 1150.

South African War, Services rendered by the Militia during.
O. Lord Newton, *July 11*, 1159.

Colours, Adding South Africa to.
Q. Mr. Emmott; *A.* Mr. Arnold Forster, *July 4*, 453.

[*cont.*

Militia—*cont.*
- Strength of, Deficiency in Numbers, etc.
  - *Os.* Earl of Wemyss, *July 11*, 1149; Lord Rosmead, 1165.
  - Recruiting up to Established Strength proposed.
    - *Os.* Earl of Wemyss, *July 11*, 1148, 1157.

Millstreet
- Constabulary, R.I.—Lodging-out Allowances, Names of Constables occupying Barracks, etc.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Sheehan; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 971.

Milltown Malbay
- Petty Sessions Clerk.
  - Election of, alleged Irregularities at.
    - *Q.* Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 968, 969.
  - Qualifications of, etc.
    - *Q.* Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 655-656.

Minehead Urban District Council Water Bill
- *c. Con.* July 1*, 315.
  - 3R.* *July 5*, 618.

Mines
- Animals in, Cruelty to, Number of Prosecutions for.
  - *Q.* Mr. B. Robinson; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 7*, 947, 948.
- Ankylostomiasis, Notification of, rendering compulsory.
  - *Q.* Mr. Johnson; *A.* Mr. Cochrane, *July 5*, 643.
- Electricity in—Committee, Recommendations of, etc.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Markham; *As.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 7*, 945, 946.

Mint
- Report, Annual, presented, *June 30*, 120, 141.

Mitchell, Mr. E. [Fermanagh, N.]
- Enniskillen—Fair Rents—Date of Appeal Sittings, *July 4*, 476.
- Fermanagh Co., Mail Service Alterations—Improvement in present system, proposed, *July 6*, 791.

Moon, Mr. E. R. P. [St. Pancras, N.]
- Army Pay Department—Terms of Retirement of Paymasters, *July 5*, 634.
- Fenian Raids in Canada, Medals granted for Services in repelling, *July 6*, 780.
- Macedonia.
  - Gendarmerie, Re-organisation of—Muerzteg Agreement, Exclusion of Mutessarifliks of Selfidge and Koritza from, *June 29*, 7.
  - Removal of Macedonians and Bulgarians to other parts of European Turkey, cancelling prohibition against, *June 30*, 144.
- Vladivostock, British Commercial Agent at, *June 29*, 7.

Mooney, Mr. J. J. [Dublin County, S.]
- Kingstown and Dalkey Polling Districts—Complaints as to tampering with Voters' Requisition Forms, *July 11*, 1209.
- Rathmines.
  - Commissioners' Appeal against Local Government Board Decision, Delay in deciding, *July 4*, 472.
  - Polling.
    - Complaints as to tampering with Requisition Forms, *July 11*, 1209.
    - Excluding unauthorised Persons from, *July 4*, 471.

Moore, Mr. W. [Antrim, N.]
- Ballinasloe Asylum—Appointment of Dr. Kirwan as Medical Superintendent, *July 7*, 1044, 1045.
- Labourers (Ireland) Bill.
  - Date of taking, *July 6*, 807.
  - Motion to Commit to Standing Committee on Trade, *July 8*, 1095, 1096.
- Land (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 8*, 1128, 1130.

Morgan, Mr. D. J. [Essex, Walthamstow]
- Tobacco Cultivation Experiments in Ireland, Arrangements for, *July 6*, 798.

Morgan, Mr. J. L. [Carmarthen, W.]
- Milner, Lord, Plot to Murder—Arrests, etc., *June 30*, 155.

Morley, Rt. Hon. J. [Montrose, Burghs.]
- Licensing Bill Procedure Resolution, *July 1*, 388; *July 4*, 490-493. 496, 515.

Morpeth, Viscount [Birmingham, South]
- Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *July 13*, 1514.

Motherwell and Bellshill Railway (Abandonment) Order Confirmation Bill
- *l.* 3R.* *June 30*, 118.

Motor Cars
- Accidents caused by, Compared with those caused by Horses and Horse-drawn Vehicles.
  - *Q.* Mr. Scott-Montagu; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 6*, 772.
- London, Speed Regulations in.
  - *Q.* Mr C. Wason; *A.* Mr. G. Lawson, *July 7*, 960.
  - Hyde Park, Speed Regulations in.
    - *Os.* Mr. Scott-Montagu, Mr. Whitley, Mr. Disraeli, *June 30*, 263, 264.

Moulton, Mr. J. F. [Cornwall, Launceston]
- Divisions, members personally or pecuniarily interested in—Liability to have Vote struck off, *July 6*, 912.
- Licensing Bill.
  - *Com. July 5*, 766.
  - Procedure Resolution, *July 4*, 535, 538.

Mountmellick, Queen's County
Cut, The, Closure of, by Military Authorities—Allowing Peat fuel to be secured from adjoining Bogs.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *July 11*, 1217.

Moy District, Ireland
House to house inquiries by police, alleged.
Q. Mr Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 951, 952.
Nationalist Demonstration—Allowing Procession to proceed by road from Trew to Moy Station.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, Mr. Speaker, *July 11*, 1212

Muir Bay
Trawling in, within Prohibited Area, Alleged—Visit of the "Granuaile," etc.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 799.

Munster
Dairy School—Delay in carrying out Improvements.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 647–649.

Muntz, Sir P. A. [Warwickshire, Tamworth]
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *July 12*, 1429, 1431.

Murphy, Mr. J. [Kerry, E.]
Agricultural Department.
Officers' Salaries and Travelling Expenses, *June 29*, 23.
Organisation Society, Annual Amount paid to, etc., *June 29*, 22.
Winter dairying, Steps to promote, *July 4*, 472–473.
Congested Districts Board, Estates purchased by, in Kerry, Prices paid for, etc., *July 7*, 1006.
Evicted Tenants, Delay in Re-instatement of, *July 7*, 1005.
Great Southern and Western Railway Company—Glounbawn Level Crossing, Closing of, *July 4*, 486.
Irish Agricultural Organisation Society, Money paid to, by Agricultural Department—Reasons for, &c., *July 6*, 792.
Kenmare Estate, Sale of—Applications received, &c., *July 7*, 961, 962.
Kerry, Daily Postal Deliveries for Townlands in, *July 4*, 484.
Land Purchase, Kerry—Demands for Gale Rents — Purchasing Hickson and M'Cartie Estates, etc., *June 30*, 166–167.
McGillycuddy Estate, Sale of.
Exclusion of certain Tenants, *July 4*, 484.
Re-instatement of Evicted Tenant, *July 6*, 793, 794.
Munster Dairy School—Delay in carrying out Improvements, *July 5*, 647–649.

Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G.—*Secretary for Scotland* [Buteshire]
Children, Employment of — Scotland — Number of Bye-Laws sent by Local Authorities for Confirmation, etc., *July 6*, 775.
Hygiene, Teaching of, *July 11*, 1188.
Parish Charities, granting Return of, *July 11*, 1187–1188.
Paupers, Increase of, in Scotland—Inquiry as to causes, proposed, *July 13*, 1461, 1462.
Workhouses, Aged Poor as Inmates of, Proportion of, to those receiving Outdoor Relief, Increase in, *July*, 1188–1189.

Museums
British Museum—Bronze lions removed from railings, Disposal of.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *July 6*, 773.

Muskerry, Lord
British flag, Protection afforded by, to persons travelling by sea, *July 12*, 1327.
Merchant Shipping.
"Antillian," S.S.—Imprisonment of Capt. Wescott, at Vera Cruz—Compensation claim, etc., *July 7*, 923.
Brussels Maritime Conference, Representation of Great Britain at, *July 7*, 927.
Nautical Charities, number, administration, etc., of—Return proposed, *July 1*, 267.
Merchant Shipping Act (1894) Amendment Bill, 2R. *June 30*, 122, 136.

Nannetti, Mr. J. P. [Dublin, College Green]
Dublin — Harcourt Street Postmaster, Salary of, *July 11*, 1216–1217.
"Homewood," Mutiny on, alleged—Composition of crew, *July 12*, 1357.
Merchant Service — Foreign Sailors on British Ships—"Southern Cross"—Proposed Government Action, *June 30*, 161.
Ordnance Survey Department—Reduction of Divisional Officer's Pay for visiting sick wife—Restoring Pay, *July 11*, 1208.
Post Office.
Letter Weighing, Provision of Scales, etc., by Department in Sub Offices, Proposed, *July 1*, 319.
Wages—Bradford Committee Report, Date of Tabling, *July 13*, 1482.
Stony Stratford, Postmastership of, Explanation of Appointment to, *July 11*, 1206.

Natal

Immigration Act (1903), alleged Infringement of, by the "Tweeddale"—Steps to be taken.
  Q. Major Seely ; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, Mr. Speaker, *July 4*, 463-464.
Indians in, Suicide among.
  Q. Sir M. Bhownaggree ; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 30*, 157-158.

National Gallery, Ireland

Report (1903) presented, *June 29*, 4.

National School Teachers, Ireland

Assistant Teachers.
  Number, Promotion Regulations, etc.
    Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 12*, 1353, 1354.
  Pay—Granting Higher Second Grade Salary to Ten Years' Service Teachers.
    Qs. Mr. T. O'Donnell ; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 29*, 27 ; *July 12*, 1353, 1354.
Ballynaclosha School, Income of Principal Teacher of.
  Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 448-449.
  Q. Mr. P. A. McHugh ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 3*, 630.
Contributions by, to Upkeep of Schools, 1900-1904, granting Return showing.
  Q. Mr. P. A. McHugh ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 630.
Junior Literary Assistants, Pensions for, proposed.
  Q. Mr. O'Doherty ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 12*, 1353.
Promotions—Record of Teachers promoted, 1900-1903.
  Q. Mr. Sloan ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 479.

Salaries.
  Down County, Principal Teacher in—Claim to Increment of Salary.
    Q. Mr. MacVeagh ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 450-451.
  Increasing, to Standard of English Teachers.
    Q. Mr. Field ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 658.
  Kilrusheightey, Principal Teacher, Income of—Payment for Tuition in Agriculture, etc.
    Qs. Mr. P. A. McHugh, Mr. T. O'Donnell ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 646-648.
    Qs. Mr. P. A. McHugh ; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 12*, 1360-1361.
  Lurgan, Victoria Street — Loss of Income, alleged.
    Q. Col. Saunderson ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 13*, 1467-1469.

Naughten, Martin

Arrest of—Examination of Arresting Constable.
  Q. Mr. O'Malley ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 151.

Nautical Charities

Number, Administration, etc. — Return Proposed.
  Os. Lord Muskerry, *July 1*, 267 ; Lord Wolverton, 268.

Navy

First Lord—Earl of Selborne.
Financial Secretary— Mr. E. G. Pretyman
Bases—Rosyth, Progress of Works at.
  Q. Mr. Scott-Montagu ; *A.* Mr. A. Lee, *July 13*, 1464, 1465.
Boilers.
  Coal Consumption per h.p.
    Q. Sir C. Dilke ; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 6*, 774, 775.
  Committee on, Date of Presenting Report of.
    Os. Mr. E. Robertson, Sir C. Dilke, *June 30*, 221 ; Mr. Pretyman, 225.
    Q. Sir C. Dilke ; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 6*, 774, 775.
"Centurion," H.M.S., Defective Condition of Gun Sights of
  Q. Mr. G. Bowles ; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 11*, 1199-1200.
Chaplain and Naval Instructor, combining Office of, Proposed.
  Q. Mr. Lyell ; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *June 30*, 145.

Coal.
  Consumption of, per h.p.
    Q. Sir C. Dilke ; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 6*, 774, 775.
  Supply of, to Foreign Warships, regulations as to.
    Os. Mr. G. Bowles, June 30, 222 ; Mr. Pretyman, 226.
    Q. Mr. G. Bowles ; *A.* Mr. A J. Balfour, *July 11*, 1219-1220.

Contracts—Fair Wages Resolution and the Employment of Union or Non-Union Men—Case of Messrs. Lysaght.
  Qs. Mr. C. Hobhouse, Sir C. Dilke ; *As.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 6*, 781.
  Qs. Mr. C. Hobhouse, Mr. S. Buxton, Mr. Shackleton ; *As.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 13*, 1474, 1475.

Dockyards—*See that Title.*

Flogging in.
  Birches, Keeping Official Patterns of, in Dockyards—Allowing Inspection by Members.
    Q. Mr. S. MacNeill ; *As.* Mr. Pretyman, Mr. Speaker, *July 5*, 635-636.

[*cont.*

Navy—*cont.*
Flogging in—*cont.*
Cat-o'-Nine Tails, Suggested Abolition of.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 4*, 457–458.
Statistics as to—Granting Summary of Daily Records.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 5*, 636.
Gun Sights—
"Centurion," H.M.S., Defective Condition of.
Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 11*, 1199–1200.
"Prince of Wales," H.M.S., old-fashioned Pattern of—Making Alterations, etc.
Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 11*, 1200–1201.
Interpreters—
Examinations, Regulations as to.
Os. Lord Ellenborough, *July 8*, 1075, 1076; Earl of Selborne, 1081.
Executive Officers.
Extra Allowances, Number in Receipt of.
Os. Lord Ellenborough, *July 8*, 1071; Earl of Selborne, 1079.
Number qualified in Russian, German and Japanese.
Os. Lord Ellenborough, *July 8*, 1070; Earl of Selborne, 1078.
Facilities and Inducements for Learning Foreign Languages, Increase in—Admiralty Circular.
Os. Lord Ellenborough, *July 8*, 1074–1076; Earl of Selborne, 1078, 1079, 1082.
Increase in Number of, from 20 limit to 36, proposed.
Os. Lord Ellenborough, *July 8*, 1074, 1077.
Midshipmen, Prizes to, Increased Value of.
O. Earl of Selborne, *July 8*, 1080.
Number in different Branches of the Service who have Passed as Interpreters in various Languages.
Os. Lord Ellenborough, *July 8*, 1071, 1072; Earl of Selborne, 1078.
Russo-Japanese War, Study of—Necessity for Officers having a knowledge of Japanese and Russian.
Os. Lord Ellenborough, *July 8*, 1072, 1073; Earl of Selborne 1078.
Studying Abroad, Granting Facilities for.
Os. Viscount Sidmouth, *July 8*, 1077; Earl of Selborne, 1079, 1081, 1082.

Navy—*cont.*
Interpreters—*cont.*
Technical Terms, Inclusion of, in Standard, proposed.
Os. Lord Ellenborough, *July 8*, 1075, 1076; Earl of Selborne, 1081.
Wei-hai-wei, Appointment of Japanese Instructor at.
O. Earl of Selborne, *July 8*, 1080.
Kinsale, Proselytising Practices of Commander Salwey at—Removal from Kinsale District.
Q. Mr. Crean; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 11*, 1215–1216.
Manœuvres—Autumn Programme of Movements—Suggested Visit of Channel Fleet to the Tyne.
Q. Mr. Renwick; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *June 30*, 153.
Mediterranean Squadron—Rome, Display by men in, Responsibility for, Sanction of Italian Government, etc.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 13*, 1462.
Navigation Course—New Scheme—Warrant Officers, Appointment of, to Posts entailing Navigation duties, proposed.
Q. Mr. E. Robertson; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 7*, 953.
Oil Fuel, Supply of, in this Country.
Os. Mr. G. Bowles, *June 30*, 222; Mr. Pretyman, 226.
Pensions—W. Welsford, Devonport Shipwright, Reason for not assigning Pension to.
Q. Mr. Kearley; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 5*, 621–622.
"Prince of Wales," H.M.S., Gun Sights of, Old-fashioned Pattern of—Making Alterations, etc.
Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 11*, 1200–1201.
Rosyth Base—Progress of Works.
Q. Mr. Scott-Montagu; *A.* Mr. A. Lee, *July 13*, 1464–1465.
Schoolmasters in, Improving *status* and Pay of, etc.
Q. Mr. Yoxall; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 11*, 1191.
"Scouts."
Bunker capacity, Coal consumption, Maintenance of Speed, etc.
Q. Sir J. Colomb; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 5*, 626.
Cost, Purposes and Success of, Information as to.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *June 30*, 221; Mr. G. Bowles, 222; Mr. Pretyman, 223–225; Mr. Buchanan, 227.
Shipbuilding.
Programme for 1903, Distributing Balance of Orders for.
Q. Mr. J. F. Hope; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 5*, 621.

[*cont.*

Navy—*cont.*
Shipbuilding—*cont.*
Programme for 1904-5, Information as to, and Opportunity for Discussing.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *June 30*, 217, 218; Mr. E. Robertson, 220.

Submarine A1, Loss of, Court of Inquiry into—Date of Presenting Report.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *June 30*, 221; Mr. Pretyman, 225.

Submarine Mines, questionable policy of placing under control of the War Office.
O. Sir J. Colomb, *June 30*, 196.

Sunday, Observance of—Action of Mediterranean Fleet.
Q. Sir Mark Stewart; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 4*, 446.

Torpedoes, Brennan, Expenditure on—Objections to placing on the Army Estimates.
O. Sir J. Colomb, *June 30*, 196.
Q. Sir J. Colomb; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 5*, 633–4.

Training Ships—"St. Vincent," Discontinuing Training on.
Q. Mr. R. Lucas; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 11*, 1191.

Volunteers, Granting Allowance to meet Expense of Instruction for.
Q. Mr. Kearley; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *June 30*, 144–145.

Wei-hai-wei.
Coaling Accommodation at, Provision of.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *June 30*, 218; Mr. Pretyman, 219.

Expenditure on, and Retention of, as a Naval Station.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *June 30*, 218; Mr. Pretyman, 219.

Navy Estimates
Armaments—£3,646,000, Rep. *June 30*, 209.
Debate on, Postponement of, Proposed.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, Mr. Pretyman, *June 30*, 211.

Civil Pensions and Gratuities—£353,300, Rep., *June 30*, 211.

Date of Taking
Os. Mr E. Robertson, Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 12*, 1367.

Half Pay, Reserved and Retired Pay—£706,200, Rep., *June 30*, 211.

Martial Law, etc.—£15,500, Rep., *June 30*, 210.

Medical Establishments and Services—£293,000, Rep.* *June 30*, 210.

Miscellaneous Effective Services—£444,000, Rep., *June 30*, 210.

Royal Naval Reserve—£404,500, Rep. *June 30*, 210.

Scientific Services—£72,600, Rep., *June 30*, 210.

Navy Estimates—*cont.*
Shipbuilding, Maintenance and Repairs etc.
Financial Effect of passing Resolutions—Allocation of Money granted for one purpose to another, etc.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *June 30*, 212, 213, 215; Mr. Buchanan, 213; Mr. Bryce, Mr. G. Bowles, Mr. A. Chamberlain, 214.

Matériel—£5,062,800, Rep., *June 30*, 210.

Personnel—£3,044,200, Rep., *June 30*, 210.

Victualling and Clothing — £2,428,000, Rep., *June 30*, 210.

Neath, Pontardawe and Brynaman Railway Bill
c. Rep.* *July 12*, 1346.

New Orleans
Trade Report Presented, *June 30*, 119.

New Writs and New Members Sworn
see those titles under Parliamentary By-elections.

Newcastle-on-Tyne
Electric Railways—Protection of Live Rails.
Q. Mr. Renwick; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 4*, 470.

Newton, Lord
Militia—Compulsory Service—Recommendations of the Norfolk Commission, etc., *July 11*, 1157–1161.

Nigeria, Northern
Currency, Orders regulating, Presented, *June 30*, 120, 141.

Expenditure, Increased—Question of Reduction, etc.
Q. Mr. Lough; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 30*, 159.

Military Operations in, Information as to.
Q. Dr. Farquharson; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 13*, 1473.

Nolan, Col. J. P. [Galway, N.]
Army Rifle, New Pattern—Length of Barrel, Strength of Recoil, etc., *June 30*, 203, 204.

Ballinasloe Asylum—Appointment of Dr. Kirwan as Medical Superintendent, *July 7*, 1029.

Norfolk, Duke of
Transubstantiation, King's Declaration against—Alteration in form of Oath proposed, *July 1*, 268, 299, 301, 309.

North British Railway (General Powers) Order Confirmation Bill
l. 3R.* *June 30*, 118.

North Eastern Sea Fisheries District
Variation of—Order Presented, *July 12*, 1326, 1348.

North Wales Electric Power Bill
c. Rep.* *July 7*, 943.

North Western Electricity and Power Gas Bill
l. Rep.* *June 30*, 117.
3R.* *July 8*, 1049.

Northumberland, Duke of
Transubstantiation, King's Declaration Against—Alteration in Form of Oath proposed, *July 1*, 306.

Norton, Lord
Education (Transferred Schools) Bill, 2R., *July 4*, 424, 426.

Norton, Captain C. W. [Newington, W.]
Army.
Clothing Factory—Pressing Rooms, Improving Ventilation of, *June 29*, 11.
Guns, Machine.
Cost, Relative, of, Manufactured by the Government and the Trade, *June 30*, 198, 199.
Number in Use, Number Ordered, Cost, etc., *July 6*, 782.
Rifles.
Lee-Enfield, Defects of, etc., *June 30*, 196, 197.
New Pattern, Defects of, Strength of Recoil, etc., *June 30*, 197, 198.
India.
Army, Drafts for—Number of Men with less than Five Years to Serve, *July 13*, 1469.
Assistant Military Secretary, Appointment of, *July 11*, 1204.
Trooping Season—Regiments Destined for India, etc., *June 30*, 153–154.
Telegraphists—Volunteer Annual Inspection, Leave Regulations as to, *July 8*, 1091.
Transvaal, Importation of Chinese Labour to—Beri-beri Outbreak, Date of, etc., *June 29*, 14.
Volunteers—Telegraphists, Leave Regulations of, for Attendance at Annual Inspection, *July 8*, 1091.

Nussey, Mr. T. W. [Pontefract]
Licensing Bill, *Com. July 12*, 1451; *July 13*, 1510.

Observatories
Cape of Good Hope—Report (1903) presented, *July 4*, 391, 444.

O'Brien, Mr. J. F. X. [Cork]
Agriculture Department—Small Industries, Development of, *July 30*, 173.
Cork Post Office.
Punishments, Disparity in, alleged, *July 7*, 973, 974.
Tracts, Distribution of, by Commander Salwey—Stopping Practice, *June 30*, 176–177.
Education—Woodwork Instruction, training Teachers for—Object of Course, etc., *June 29*, 23.

O'Brien, Mr. K. [Tipperary, Mid.]
Dowling, Thomas, Sale of Estate of—Terms of Sale, Withdrawal of Village of Cappawhite, &c., *July 7*, 964.
Roscrea Post Office—Refusal to pay claim of late Postmaster for Structural Alterations, *July 11*, 1189.

O'Brien, Mr. P. [Kilkenny]
Miltown Malbay Petty Sessions Clerk.
Election of, alleged irregularities at *July 7*, 969.
Qualifications of, *July 3*, 655, 656.

O'Brien Estate
Sale of—Position of Negotiations.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 776.

O'Connor, Mr. J. [Wicklow, W.]
Wicklow Camp Canteen Licence—Action of Mr. Shanks; *June 30*, 170–171; *July 11*, 1215.

O'Doherty, Mr. W. [Donegal, S.]
Burtonport Railway—Gross Earnings per Mile per Week, etc., *June 30*, 175.
Donegal.
Crimelessness of—Revoking Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act 1881, *June 30*, 149.
Marine Works Act, Allocation of Money under, *July 5*, 632.
Innishowen District, Fair Rent Appeals from, etc., *June 30*, 149–150.
Knocknagin, Delay in erecting School at, *July 7*, 951.
National School Teachers—Junior Literary Assistants, Pensions for, proposed, *July 12*, 1353.
Portasantal, Construction of Sea Wall and Boat Slip at, *June 5*, 633.
Schoolhouse Plans and Estimates, Ireland, Delay in sanctioning, Alleged, *July 7*, 965, 966.
Telephone Service, Establishing, between Ballymena and Londonderry, *June 29*, 6.

O'Donnell, Mr. T. [Kerry, W.]
- Alcohol for Manufacturing purposes—Definition of Silent Spirit, *July 6*, 791.
- Annascaul—Valuation of Mr. O'Donnell's Lands—Refunding Excess Taxation, *July 4*, 452.
- Ballinaclosha, Salary of Teacher at—Loss due to closure of School from Epidemic, *July 4*, 448.
- Bateman Estate, Tralee—Demands for Gale Rents—Forcing Tenants to accept Landlord's Terms, etc., *June 30*, 167-169.
- Blennerhasset Estate.
  - Sale of—Reinstatement of evicted Tenant, *July 6*, 795.
  - Upkeep of Banks, Authority responsible for, etc., *June 29*, 27.
- Coleraine, Publican at, Alleged Police Persecution of, *June 30*, 169.
- Dingle—Valuation Error in holding of Thomas O'Donnell, alleged—Refunding money proposed, *July 7*, 970, 971.
- Estates adjoining Sea—Authority responsible for Upkeep of Banks for Tenant Purchasers, *June 29*, 27, 28.
- Fair Rents—Appeals and Originating Notices, Delay in hearing, *June 7*, 1002.
- Fish, Cured, American Import duty on—Inducing withdrawal, proposed, *July 6*, 794.
- Kerry.
  - Fair Rent Appeals—Hearing delayed Appeals, *July 5*, 651.
  - Parish Committees, Exclusion of Shopkeepers from—Reason for Rule—Suggested withdrawal, *June 30*, 171.
- Kilrusheightey, Principal Teacher of, Income of—Payment for Tuition in Agriculture, *July 5*, 648.
- Land Act of 1903, Working of, *July 7*, 1001, 1002.
- Land (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 8*, 1116.
- Listellick Farm, Kerry, Purchase of, by Congested Districts Board, *June 30*, 169.
- National School Teachers, Ireland—Assistant Teachers.
  - Number, Promotion Regulations, etc., *July 12*, 1353.
  - Second Grade Salary, Granting, to Ten Years' Service Teachers, *June 29*, 27; *July 12*, 1353.
- Phœnix Park — Exclusion of National Games—Preference given to Polo and Cricket, *June 30*, 172.
- Rae Estate, Kerry, proposed Purchase of, by Congested Districts Board, *June 30*, 174; *July 12*, 1366.

O'Dowd, Mr. J. [Sligo, S]
- Granville Knox Estate, Mayo, Sale of—Memorial from Tenants, *July 11*, 1212-1213.
- Owenmore River, Drainage of—Grant in Aid to Local Effort suggested, *July 5*, 657; *July 7*, 965.
- Sligo.
  - Estates purchased by Congested Districts Board—Purchase Money—Gross Rentals, etc., *July 5*, 622-623, 656.
  - Harlech Estate—Sale of Grazing Farm over Heads of Tenants, making Inquiry into, etc., *July 5*, 656, 657.

O'Kelly, Mr. J. [Roscommon, N.]
- Licensing Bill Procedure Resolution, *July 1*, 336.
- Strokestown, Drainage of Rivers in District of, *July 5*, 646.

O'Malley, Mr. W. [Galway, Connemara]
- Naughten, Martin, Arrest of—Examination of arresting Constable, *June 30*, 151.

O'Shaughnessy, Mr. P. J. [Limerick, W.]
- Butter, Irish Salt Firkin — Number of Prosecutions for excessive moisture, *July 13*, 1487.

O'Shee, Mr. J. J. [Waterford, W.]
- Constabulary, R. I.—Tallow, Extra Force requisitioned at for one day—Reason, Payment of Expense, etc., *July 7*, 969.
- Development Grant (Ireland) Bill—Petty Sessions Clerks Fund, Withdrawing Clause as to, *July 5*, 650.
- Labourers' Cottages.
  - Cost of Providing Additional Half-acres, *July 11*, 1213.
  - Number of Schemes for, *July 7*, 946, 969.
- Labourers (Ireland) Act, Registration of Title Under—Cost, &c., *July 6*, 802.

Oil Fuel for the Navy
- Supply of, in this Country.
  - *O.* Mr. G. Bowles, *June 30*, 222.

Omagh
- Street Obstructions, Removal of.
  - *Q.* Dr. Thompson; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *July 12*, 1350.

Open Spaces Bill
- *l.* Rep.* *June 30*, 137.
  - 3R.* *July 1*, 313.

Orange River Colony
- Affairs of — Correspondence Presented, *July 4*, 391, 414.
- Finance—Correspondence Presented, *June 29*, 4; *June 30*, 119.

Ordnance Survey Department
Reduction of Divisional Officer's Pay for Visiting Sick Wife—Restoring Pay.
Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *July 11*, 1208.

Oregon
Trade Report Presented, *July 7*, 920.

Oswestry
Parliamentary By-election — New Writ, *July 12*, 1368.

Owenmore River
Drainage of—Grant in Aid to Local Effort Suggested.
Qs. Mr. O'Dowd; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 657; *July 7*, 965.

Paisley District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill
l 3R.* *June 30*, 118.

Palaces, Royal
Holyrood, Condition of, Expenditure on Improvements, etc.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Caldwell, *June 30*, 229; Lord Balcarres, 230.
Maintenance and Repairs, Cost of.
Os. Mr. Whitley, Mr. G. Bowles, *June 30*, 228; Lord Balcarres, 230; Mr. J. Burns, 230–232.
St. James's, Improvements to Wine Cellars of, Expenditure on.
Os. Mr. Caldwell, Lord Balcarres, *June 30*, 229.

Palmer, Sir Walter [Salisbury]
Salisbury, Officers Warned for Removal from, *July 11*, 1197.

Palmers Estate, Mayo.
Purchase of.
Q. Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 477.

Panna
Administration of—Reason for Suspending Chief, etc.
Q. Mr. Schwann; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 30*, 159–160.

Parcel Post
See under Post Office.

Parks and Gardens
Hyde Park.
Motor Cars in, Speed Regulations for, etc.
Os. Mr. Scott-Montagu, Mr. Whitley, Mr. Disraeli, *June 30*, 263, 264.
Roads, Condition of.
O. Mr. Tennant, *June 30*, 234.
Row, Extension of, proposed.
Os. Mr. G. Bowles, *June 30*, 232; Mr. Labouchere, 233.

Parks and Gardens—*cont.*
Phœnix Park, Dublin.
National Games, Exclusion of—Preference given to Polo and Cricket.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 172–173.
Traders' Vans, Regulations as to, etc.
Q. Mr. Clancy; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *July 11*, 1216.
St. James's—Condition of Roads.
O. Mr. Tennant, *June 30*, 234.
Traffic Regulations—Enforcing Ten-mile Limit for Horse-drawn Vehicles.
Q. Mr. Scott-Montagu; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *July 5*, 645.

Parliament
Dissolution of, Non-appearance of Question on, alleged.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Speaker, *July 7*, 981.
House of Commons.
Business of the House, *see that title.*
Central Hall, Crowd in, on 4th inst., alleged.
Qs. Mr. Pierpoint; *A.* Mr. Speaker, *July 7*, 981, 982.
Divisions, Members personally or pecuniarily interested in—Liability to have Vote struck off.
Os. Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 6*, 903, 909, 910; Mr. S. MacNeill, 903; Mr. J. W. Lowther, 903, 905, 910–913; Mr. Dalziel, Mr. T. Shaw, Mr. Emmott, 911; Mr. Whittaker, Mr. Moulton, 912; Mr. W. Churchhill, 913.
House of Lords.
Lord Chancellor, powers of, to call any other Member to order.
Qs. Marquess of Ripon, Earl of Halsbury, *June 30*, 121.
Representative Peers for Ireland.
Henniker, Lord, right of, to Vote at elections, *July 1*, 265; *July 5*, 601; *July 7*, 917.
Sat first.
Gordon, Duke of (Duke of Richmond), *July 11*, 1145.
Hartismere, Lord (Lord Henniker) after the death of his father, *July 7*, 917.
Richmond, Duke of, after the death of his father, *July 7*, 917.

Parliamentary By-elections
New Members Sworn.
Bingham, Lord, for Surrey (Chertsey Division), *July 11*, 1224.
Higham, Mr. J. S., for Yorkshire, West Riding (Sowerby Division), *July 5*, 659.
New Writ—Salop (Western or Oswestry Division), *July 12*, 1368.

Parliamentary Elections
- Redistribution of Seats, Prospect of Bill for.
  - *Q.* Sir W. Greene ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 11*, 1221-1222.

Parrot, Mr. [Yorks, W.R., Normanton]
- Urban District Councils—Chairman's Power of Voting, *July 5*, 622.

Paupers
- Scotland, Increase of pauperism in, Causes of—Inquiry proposed.
  - *Q.* Mr. A. Cross ; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *July, 13*, 1461.

Pease, Mr. J. A. [Essex, Saffron Walden]
- Licensing Bill, *Com., July 11*, 1282 ; *July 13*, 1531.
- Tyneside Tramways and Tramroads Bill, *Com., June 30*, 257.

Pease, Mr. H. P. [Darlington]
- Licensing Bill Procedure Resolution, *July 1*, 339.

Peat
- Factory at Inny Junction, Success of, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Farrell ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 449-450.
- Gas produced from—Success of Experiment—Establishing Industry in Ireland.
  - *Q.* Mr. Farrell ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July, 4*, 450.

Peel, Mr. W. R. [Manchester, S.]
- Aliens Bill, Obstruction to, *July 11*, 1221.
- Licensing Bill, *Com., July 6*, 856 ; *July 12*, 1423, 1425.
- Port of London Bill, Date of Taking, *July 11*, 1222.

Pemba
- Mshangama, Freed Slave—Result of Appeal against Decision of Commissioner.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Bayley ; *As.* Earl Percy, *July 7*, 957.

Pemberton, Mr. J. S. G. [Sunderland]
- Licensing Bill, *Com., July 12*, 1404.

Pensions
- Navy, *see under* Navy.

Percy, Earl—*Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs* [Kensington, S.]
- Abyssinia — Commercial Treaty with United States, *June 29*, 7.
- Africa, East.
  - Alien Settlement in—Tabling Terms of Proposed Grants, etc., *June 30*, 161.
  - Protectorate.
    - Administration of—Dismissal of Mr. Hopton, Reason for, etc., *July 5*, 640.
    - Estimates for Service of, Obtaining, by Members, *July 5*, 641.
      - Additional Particulars, proposed, *July 7*, 957.
  - Syndicate, Concessions Granted to, *June 29*, 18.

Percy, Earl—*cont.*
- "Allanton," Seizure of—Reasons for Confiscation of Cargo by Russian Prize Court, etc., *July 7*, 956.
- Brussels International Maritime Conference, Refusal of Great Britain to be Officially Represented at—Reason, *July 4*, 468.
- Bulgaria—Prohibition against Inhabitants moving to other Parts of European Turkey, removing, *June 30*, 144.
- Corfu—Site of English Cemetery, Reasons for Exchange, Present Use of Site, etc., *July 8*, 1089.
- Fisheries, North Sea—Investigation, inducing French Government to take part in, *June 30*, 143.
- Lottery Circulars, Foreign—Preventing Postage in Great Britain, *July 4*, 468-469.
- Macedonia.
  - Gendarmerie.
    - European Officers, duties of—Hilmi Pacha's Circular, *July 6*, 789.
    - Muerzteg Agreement, Exclusion of Mutessarifliks of Selfidge and Koritza from, *June 29*, 7.
  - Removal by Inhabitants to other Parts of European Turkey, cancelling prohibition against, *June 30*, 144.
  - Tithe Reform, Schemes for, *July 13*, 1478.
- Pemba—Mshangama, Freed Slave—Result of Appeal against decision of Commissioner, *July 7*, 957.
- Russo-Japanese War.
  - "Allanton," ss.—Seizure by Russians—Proposed Government Action, *July 4*, 446, 467.
  - British Mail Steamers, Stoppage of, by Russian Warships—Making Inquiry, *July 11*, 1205.
  - Newchwang, Protection of British Subjects at, *July 4*, 469.
- Somaliland.
  - Administration of.
    - Commissioner, Department directing, etc., *July 6*, 788.
    - European staff required, strength of garrison, etc., *July 6*, 787, 788.
  - Mullah—Present position, arms, and strength of following, *July 6*, 787, 788.
- Sugar—Brussels Convention, Expenditure on, Details of, *July 6*, 789.
- Trade Reports, reasons for delay in printing, *July 1*, 319.
- Turkey, Consular Representation in, Suggested Augmentation of, *July 5*, 640.

[*cont.*

Percy, Earl—*cont.*
- Uganda—Estimates for Service of, obtaining, by Members, *July 5*, 641.
  - Additional particulars, proposed, *July 7*, 957.
- United States—Commercial Treaty with Abyssinia, *June 29*, 7.
- Vladivostock, British Commercial Agent at, *June 29*, 7.
- Zanzibar.
  - Regent of, Complaints as to Proceedings of, *July 11*, 1204.
  - Sultan, Minority of—Arrangements for direction of affairs, *July 7*, 950.

Persia
- Trade Report Presented, *July 6*, 771; *July 7*, 920.

Petitions Committee, Public
- Reports Presented, *July 29*, 34.

Petty Sessions
- Ireland — Clerks' Fund — Transferring Credit Balance to Treasury—Withdrawing Clause in Irish Development Grant Bill.
  - *Q.* Mr. O'Shee; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 650.

Phœnix Park, Dublin
- National Games, Exclusion of—Preference given to Polo and Cricket.
  - *Q.* Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 172–173.
- Traders' Vans, etc., Regulations as to, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Clancy; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *July 11*, 1216.
- Upkeep of—Removal of Fallen and Decayed Trees.
  - *Os.* Sir T. Esmonde, *July 7*, 1018; Mr. V. Cavendish, 1024.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill
- *c.* Rep.* *July 1*, 315.
  - 3R.* *July 4*, 439.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill
- Report from Committee—Division of Bill into two Bills, (No. 2 and No. 3) *July 13*, 1457.

Pierpoint, Mr. R. [Warrington]
- House of Commons—Crowd in Central Hall on 4th inst., alleged, *July 7*, 981.

Piers and Harbours
- Ireland.
  - Arklow, Dredger Provided for, by the Board of Works, Defects of.
    - *Os.* Sir T. Esmonde, *July 7*, 1022; Mr. V. Cavendish, 1023.
  - Bangor, Provision of Harbour for, Grant, etc.
    - *Q.* Mr. T. L. Corbett, *July 7*, 1024.

Piers and Harbours—*cont.*
- Ireland—*cont.*
  - County Councils, Transfer of Powers from Harbour Authorities to, Bill for.
    - *Q.* Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 11*, 1210.
  - Grants for, Withheld by the Board of Works.
    - *Os.* Sir T. Esmonde, *July 7*, 1021; Mr. V. Cavendish, 1023.
  - Kinvara, Improvement at, Proposed.
    - *Q.* Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 963.
  - Mayo, Government Advances for Harbour Works in, etc.
    - *Qs.* Mr. C. Craig, Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 479–480.
  - Transfer of Powers to County Councils, Legislation to Sanction, Proposed.
    - *Q.* Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 1*, 318.

Pilkington, Lt.-Col. R. [Lancashire, Newton]
- Licensing Bill, *Com. June 29*, 47, 77; *July 6*, 815; *July 12*, 1375.

Plummer, Sir W. R. [Newcastle-on-Tyne]
- Tyneside Tramways and Tramroads Bill, *Con.*, *June 30*, 238.

Plymouth Corporation Bill
- *c.* Lords' Amendments, *Con.** *July 8*, 1085.

Police
- Constabulary, Royal Irish, *see that title.*
- Devonport Dockyard, Granting Rent Aid to Police at.
  - *Os.* Mr. Kearley, *June 30*, 216; Mr. A. Douglas, 217.

Poor Law
- Alien Paupers within the Metropolitan Area.
  - *Q.* Sir W. Greene; *A.* Mr. Cochrane, *July 11*, 1207.
- Children—Barrack School System—Forest Gate School, Proposed Purchase by West Ham Board of Guardians, alleged.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Lough; *As.* Mr. G. Lawson, *July 13*, 1481, 1482.
- Ireland
  - Ballinasloe Medical Officer, Salary of—Reasons for refusing Increase.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Jordan, Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 800, 801.
    - *Q.* Dr. Thompson; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 13*, 1467.
  - Belfast Union—Mr. Neeson, Pension of—Amount, Basis of Calculation, etc.
    - *Q.* Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 8*, 1092.

[*cont.*

Poor Law—*cont.*
Ireland—*cont.*
Blacklion Dispensary, Improvement in Condition of.
Qs. Mr. Jordan, Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 799, 800.
Longford, Deportation of English and Scotch Paupers to.
Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 632.
Medical Relief, Outdoor, in the Metropolis, Arrangements for—Report proposed.
Q. Sir W. Foster; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *July 6*, 774.

Poor Law Medical Officers' Superannuation Bill (Ireland)
Providing Facilities for Passage of.
Q. Dr. Thompson; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 11*, 1194.

Port of London Bill
Date of taking—Removing Discharge from Order Book, &c.
Qs. Mr. J. Ellis, Mr. Peel, Mr. S. Buxton, Mr. Lough; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 11*, 1222–1223.

Portadown
Post Office, Promotion of Learner in—Making Inquiry, etc.
Q. Mr. Wood; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 11*, 1190.

Portasantal
Sea Wall and Boat Slip, Construction of.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 633.

Portmadoc, Beddgelert and South Snowdon Railway Bill
c. Rep.* *July 7*, 943.

Portsmouth, Earl of
Africa, South.
Freights to, Increase in, owing to Operations of the Shipping Ring, etc., *July 12*, 1330, 1331, 1334.
Goods shipped to, by Crown Agents during last six months—Names of Firms employed, Freights paid, etc., *July 12*, 1330.
Crown Agents — Directorships of Companies, Civil Service Regulations as to holding, *July 12*, 1323, 1330.

Portugal
Trade Report, Presented, *July 8*, 1054.

Post Office
Postmaster-General, Lord Stanley.
Cromer—Charge on Letters addressed to Post Office.
Q. Mr. Broadhurst; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 7*, 949.

Post Office—*cont.*
Engineering Department, Examinations for—Qualifications, Age limit, etc., of Candidates.
Q. Mr. Schwann; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 8*, 1090.
Great Eastern Railway—Agreement as to Conveyance of Post Office Servants and Mails by Motor Cars.
Os. Marquess of Londonderry, *July 8*, 1051; Lord Balfour of Burleigh, 1052–1054.
Ireland.
Bangor, Improvement in, proposed.
Q. Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 13*, 1489.
Belfast.
Mail Service.
London Mails, Delay in Delivery of.
Q. Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 4*, 486.
Supplementary Service to England, Leaving at 6.45 p.m., Authorising.
Q. Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 4*, 485–486.
Money Order Counter Funds, Exhaustion of.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July* 4, 484–485.
Cork Office.
Punishments, Disparity in, Alleged.
Qs. Mr. J. F. X. O'Brien; *As.* Lord Stanley, *July* 7, 973, 974.
Tracts, Distribution of, by Commander Salwey — Stopping Practice.
Qs. Mr. J. F. X. O'Brien, Mr. J. Redmond; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 30*, 176–177.
Dublin—Harcourt Street—Postmaster, Salary of.
Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 11*, 1216–1217.
Enniskillen—Missing Postal Orders—Refunding Amount to Sender.
Q. Mr. Jordan; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 30*, 176.
Fermanagh Co.—Alterations in Mails, Improvement in present system, proposed.
Q. Mr. E. Mitchell; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July* 6, 791.
Irish Language, Knowledge of, Necessary for Officials — Resolutions passed by Local Bodies, etc.
Qs. Mr. Boland; *As.* Lord Stanley, *July 12*, 1366, 1367.

[*cont.*

Post Office—*cont.*
Ireland—*cont.*
Kerry, Daily Deliveries for Townlands in.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 4*, 484.
Kilrea, New Sub-post Office at—Central Position proposed.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 8*, 1090.
Kinvara.
Letter Deliveries — Additional Facilities, proposed.
Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 7*, 974.
Learners—Age limit, Regulations as to.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 7*, 972.
Limerick Postmen, Pay of—Increase proposed.
Qs. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 7*, 974.
Portadown Office, Promotion of Learner in—Making Inquiry, etc.
Q. Mr. Wood; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 11*, 1190.
Roscrea Office—Refusal to pay Claim of late Postmaster for Structural Alterations.
Q. Mr. K. O'Brien; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 11*, 1189–1190.
Sub-postmasters, Remuneration of.
Q. Mr. Cullinan; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 1*, 319.
Telegraph and Telephone Services, *see those titles.*
Learners.
Age Limit in Ireland, Regulations as to.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 7*, 972.
Portadown Office — Promotion—Inquiry proposed.
Q. Mr. Wood; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 11*, 1190.
Letters.
Cromer—Charge on Letters addressed to Post Office.
Q. Mr. Broadhurst; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 7*, 949.
Weighing — Provision of Scales by Department in Sub-offices, proposed.
Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 1*, 319.
London.
Central Office—Meal Reliefs, altering Arrangements as to.
Q. Sir W. Foster; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 11*, 1189.
Christ's Hospital Site, Buildings to be erected on, Fixing Rateable Value of.
Q. Sir J. Dimsdale; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *June 30*, 146.

Post Office—*cont.*
London—*cont.*
Ludgate Circus—Hours of Duty.
Q. Mr. Horner; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 7*, 949.
Money Orders — Belfast County Fund, Exhaustion of.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 4*, 484–485.
Parcel Post, Foreign and Colonial—Rules and Orders (1904), Presented, *July 11*, 1148, 1185.
Postmasters.
Dublin, Harcourt Street — Salary of Postmaster.
Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 11*, 1216–1217.
Stony Stratford, Explanation of Appointment to.
Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 11*, 1206.
Sub-postmasters, Remuneration of, in Ireland.
Q. Mr. Cullinan; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 1*, 319.
Postmen, Pay of, at Limerick—Increase proposed.
Qs. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 7*, 974.
Savings Banks, *see that title.*
Stony Stratford, Postmastership of, Explanation of Appointment to.
Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 11*, 1206.
Sub-Offices—Scales and Weight for letter-weighing, Provision of, by Department proposed.
Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 1*, 319.
Telegraph and Telephone Services, *see those titles.*
Wages—Bradford Committee Report, Date of Tabling.
Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 13*, 1482.

Post Office Bill
c. 1R.* *July 11*, 1224.

Post Office Sites Bill
c. 2R.* *July 1*, 388.

Power, Mr. P. J. [Waterford, E.]
Land Act of 1903, Working of, *July 7*, 1004.
Land Commission Report, Delay in presenting, *July 7*, 1003.

President of the Board of Agriculture
Earl of Onslow.

President of the Board of Education
Marquess of Londonderry.

President of the Board of Trade
Mr. Gerald W. Balfour.

President of the Local Government Board
- *Mr. Walter H. Long.*

Preston Corporation Water Bill
- *l.* Commons' Amendments *Con.* June 30*, 117.

Pretoria
- Dutch and English in—Census Returns.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. Ellis; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 4*, 454.

Pretyman, Mr. E. G.—*Secretary to the Admiralty* [Suffolk, Woodbridge]
- Admiralty Pensions to Workmen permanently disabled, *June 3*, 219.
- Boilers.
  - Coal Consumption per H.P. *July 6*, 775.
  - Committee Report, Date of presenting, *June 30*, 225; *July 6*, 775.
- "Centurion," H.M.S.—Gun Sights, Defective Condition of, *July 11*, 1199-1200.
- Chaplain and Naval Instructor, Combining offices of, *June 30*, 145.
- Coal, Supply of, to Foreign Warships, Regulations as to, *June 30*, 226.
- Contracts—Fair Wages Resolution and the Employment of non-union Workmen—Case of Messrs. Lysaght, etc., *July 6*, 781; *July 13*, 1474, 1475.
- Estimates—Resolution I., Postponement of, *June 30*, 211.
- Flogging.
  - Birches, Keeping Official Patterns of, in Dockyards—Allowing Inspection by Members, *July 5*, 636.
  - Cat o' Nine Tails, Suggested Abolition of, *July 4*, 457-458.
  - Statistics as to—Granting Summary of Daily Records, *July 5*, 636.
- Gun Sights.
  - "Centurion," H.M.S., Defective Condition of, *July 11*, 1200.
  - "Prince of Wales" H.M.S., Old-fashioned Pattern of, etc., *July* 11, 1201.
- Kinsale, Proselytising Practices of Commander Salwey at—Removal from Kinsale, *July 11*, 1216.
- Manœuvres—Autumn Programme of Movements—Suggested visit of Channel Fleet to the Tyne, *June 30*, 153.
- Mediterranean Squadron—Rome, Display by men in, Responsibility for, Sanction of Italian Government, etc., *July 13*, 1462.
- Navigation Course—New Scheme—Appointment of Warrant Officers to posts entailing Navigation Duties, proposed, *July 7*, 953.

Pretyman, Mr. E. G.—*cont.*
- Oil Fuel, Supply of, *June 30*, 226.
- Pensions—W. Welsford, Devonport Shipwright, Reason for not assigning Pension to, *July 5*, 622.
- "Prince of Wales," H.M.S., Old-fashioned Pattern of Gun Sights of, etc., *July 11*, 1201.
- Schoolmasters, Improving *Status* and Pay of, *July 11*, 1191.
- "Scouts."
  - Bunker Capacity, Coal Consumption, Maintenance of Speed, etc., *July 5*, 626.
  - Purposes and Success of, *June 30*, 223-225.
- Shipbuilding — Distributing Balance of Orders for Programme 1903, *July 5*, 621.
- Submarine A1., Loss of, Inquiry as to, Report of Committee, etc., *June 30*, 225.
- Sunday, Observance of—Action of Mediterranean Fleet, *July 4*, 446.
- Training Ships—"St. Vincent," discontinuing Training on, *July 11*, 1191.
- Volunteers, granting Allowance to meet Expense of Instruction for, *June 30*, 144-145.
- Wei-hai-wei, Expenditure on—Provision of Coaling Accommodation, etc., *June 30*, 219-220.

Prime Minister
- *Mr. A. J. Balfour.*

"Prince of Wales," H.M.S.
- Gun Sights of, old-fashioned Pattern of—Making Alterations, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 11*, 1200-1201.

Prisoners
- Untried—Ireland—Regulations for taking finger prints, Presented, *July 12*, 1326, 1348.

Prisons
- Borstal.
  - Visiting Committee, Draft Rules as to, Presented, *July 12*, 1326, 1348.
  - Warders, Attacks on, Conduct of Prison, etc.
    - *Qs.* Dr. Macnamara, Sir E. Flower; *As.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 13*, 1479, 1480.

Private Legislation Procedure (Wales) Bill
- *c.* Rep.* *July 7*, 983.

Prosecution of Offences Acts 1879 and 1884
- Proceedings under, Working of Regulations, etc.—Return ordered, *July 12*, 1349.

Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. E. [Montgomery Boroughs]
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *July 13*, 1509.

Public Health Bill
l. 1 R* *July 8*, 1054.

Public Petitions Committee
see Petitions Committee, Public.

Public Works Loan Board
Report, Annual, Presented, *July 4*, 392, 444.

Pupil Teachers
see under Education—Teachers.

Pym, Mr. C. G. [Bedford]
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *July 13*, 1513.

Queen Anne's Bounty Fund
Re-construction, Date of Introduction of Bill for.
Q. Mr. H. C. Richards; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 7*, 952.

Queen's Colleges, Ireland.
For particular Colleges see names of towns, as Belfast, Cork, etc.
Session, Duration of
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 12*, 1362, 1363.

Questions
Order of.
Qs. Mr. Coghill; *As.* Mr. Speaker, *July 7*, 953.
Speaker's Rulings as to, *see under* Speaker.

Quilter, Sir W. C. [Suffolk, Sudbury]
Adulteration of Food and Drugs—Commission of Inquiry, Recommendations of—Appointment of Expert Officer, *July 6*, 774.

Rae Estate, Kerry
Purchase of, proposed, by Congested Districts Board.
Qs. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 174; *July 12*, 1366.

Raglan Castle
Photographing, Abolishing Charges for.
Q. Mr. McKenna; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *June 30*, 146–147.

Railway Companies Powers Act, 1864
Proceedings, &c., Board of Trade Report on (1903–4), Presented, *June 30*, 120, 140.

Railways
Chatham Military Railway—Reason for Suspension of Work—Cost of Work done.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *July 5*, 636–638.
Continuous Brakes—Return Presented, *July 13*, 1458.

Railways—*cont.*
Electric—Live Rails.
Accidents Due to—Precautions for Public Safety.
Q. Mr Channing; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *June 29*, 5–6.
Protection of Rails—North Eastern Line, Newcastle-on-Tyne.
Q. Mr. Renwick; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 4*, 470.
Ireland.
Ballinascarthy and Timoleague Light Railway—County Guarantee of Company, Levying Rate to Pay Interest on.
Q. Mr. McFadden; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 631.
Burtonport.
Agreement for Making, Alleged Changes made by Solicitor in—Publishing Correspondence, etc.
Q. Mr. McFadden; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *July 5*, 630–631.
Gross Earnings per Mile per Week, etc.
Q. Mr. McFadden; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 148–149.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *June 30*, 175–176.
Donegal—Through Bookings to and from Ballybofry.
Q. Mr. McFadden; *A.* Mr. Cavendish, *June 30*, 150–151.
Excursion Trains, Lack of Sanitary Accommodation on, Alleged.
Q. Mr. Jordan; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 7*, 959.
Great Northern—Carriage of Parcels from Tynan to Glasgow—Rates Charged.
Q. Mr. T. W. Russell; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 4*, 445.
Great Southern and Western Company—Glounbawn Level Crossing, Closing of.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 4*, 486.
Light Railways, *see that title.*
Signal Alarm, New Pattern of, Directing Attention of Companies to.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *June 30*, 145-146.
South Africa—Administration, Resolutions of Inter-Colonial Council as to Improvements in, etc.
Q. Mr. Buchanan; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 5*, 635.

Railways (Private Sidings) Bill
l. 2R. *July 5*, 603.

Rasch, Major Sir F. Carne [Essex, Chelmsford]
  Army.
    Cavalry.
      Saddles and Bridles, Weight of, *June 30*, 209.
      Swords Supplied to, Uselessness of, *June 30*, 209.
    Sandhurst College—Preliminary Examination, Fees for, *June 30*, 154.
  Licensing Bill Procedure Resolution, *July 4*, 540.
  Longford Infirmary — Refusal to take Urgent Military Cases during Closure of Military Hospital, *July 11*, 1217–1218.

Rathmines
  Commissioners, Appeal of, Against Dublin County Council — Advice of Law Officers of the Crown.
    Qs. Mr. Mooney, Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July* 4, 471, 472.
    Qs. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 798, 799.
  Polling, Excluding Unauthorised Persons from.
    Q. Mr. Mooney; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *July 4*, 471.
  Polling District—Complaints as to Tampering with Requisition Forms.
    Q. Mr. Mooney; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *July 11*, 1209.

Ratigan's Estate, Edgeworthstown
  Evictions on—Attitude of Tenants, etc.
    Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 29*, 21.

Rea, Mr. R. [Gloucester]
  Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 1292.

Reddy, Mr. M. [King's County, Birr]
  Shinrone, King's County — Evictions—Case of A. P. Doolan, *June 30*, 165–166.
  Workhouses, Classification of, basis of, *July 4*, 476.

Redmond, Mr. J. E. [Waterford]
  Constabulary.
    Anderson, Constable, Charges against, and Dismissal from the Force, *July 7*, 1039.
      Discussion of Arrangement made with Chief Unionist Whip as to, *July 7*, 1040, 1045, 1046.
  Cork Post Office—Distributon of Tracts by Commander Salwey, Stopping Practice of, *June 30*, 176.
  Development Grant Fund—Date of Presenting Estimate, etc., *July 7*, 965.
  Illig, Capture of—Use of Explosive Bullets, *June 29*, 9.

Redmond, Mr. J. E.—*cont.*
  Labourers (Ireland) Act Amendment Bill, Date of Taking, *July 6*, 807.
    Referring to Committee, proposed. *July 6*, 804.
  Land (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 8*, 1105.
  Licensing Bill Procedure Resolution, *July 4*, 501, 508.

Reformatory and Industrial Schools
  Report (1903), Presented, *July 12*, 1326, 1348.

Registration of Clubs (Ireland) Bill
  l. 2R. *July 12*, 1327.

Reid, Sir R. T. [Dumfries Burghs]
  Licensing Bill.
    Com., *June 29*, 37, 38, 67, 68, 70, 86, 90, 101, 104; *July 5*, 729, 754, 765; *July 6*, 809, 811, 816; *July 11*, 1235, 1240, 1290, 1295; *July 12*, 1374, 1386, 1419, 1422; *July 13*, 1541.
    Procedure Resolution, *July 5*, 673, 690.

Renwick, Mr. G. [Newcastle-on-Tyne]
  Licensing Bill.
    Com., *July 13*, 1554.
    Procedure Resolution, *July 5*, 708.
  Newcastle-on-Tyne Electric Railway — Protection of Live Rails, *July 4*, 470.
  Tyne, Suggested Visit of Channel Fleet to, *June 30*, 153.

Representative Peers for Ireland
  Henniker, Lord, Right of, to Vote at Elections. *July 1*, 265; *July 5*, 601; *July 7*, 917.

Reserve Forces Bill
  l. Rep.* *June 30*, 137.
  3R.* *July 1*, 313.

Re-Vaccination Bill
  l. Report from Standing Committee, *July 5*, 603.
  Rep.* *July 7*, 942.

Revenue and Expenditure
  Exchequer Bonds and Treasury Bills, Amount of outstanding.
    Q. Mr. Buchanan; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *July 12*, 1351.
  Expenditure (1903–4), Particulars as to.
    Q. Mr. McKenna; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *July 13*, 1465, 1466.

Ribblesdale, Lord
  Education (Transferred Schools) Bill, 2R. *July 4*, 428–430, 433.

Richard Jaeger's Patent Bill
  c. Rep.* *July 1*, 315.
  Con. *July 8*, 1085.
  3R.* *July 12*, 1346.

Richards, Mr. H. C. [Finsbury, E.]
Hyde Park Corner, Slippery state of wood pavement at—Provision of gravel, proposed, *July 6*, 773.
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *July 5*, 728; *July 6*, 876; *July 13*, 1559–1561.
Queen Anne's Bounty Fund, Date of introducing Bill for reconstructing, *July 7*, 952.
Religious Instruction in Non-provided Schools, Communicating Regulations as to, *July 5*, 625.

Richmond, Duke of
Sat first in Parliament after the death of his father, *July 7*, 917.

Ridley, Mr. S. F. [Bethnal Green, S.W.]
Aliens Bill—Re-introduction next Session, *July 11*, 1220.

Rifles
See under Army.

Ripon
Light Railway, Construction of, Order Authorising, presented, *July 11*, 1147, 1186.

Ripon, Marquess of
Lord Chancellor, Authority of, as Speaker of the House of Lords, *June 30*, 121.
Merchant Shipping Act (1894) Amendment Bill, 2R., *June 30*, 135.
Transubstantiation, King's Declaration against—Alteration in form of Oath, proposed, *July 1*, 284, 290, 291.

Ritchie, Rt. Hon. C. T. [Croydon]
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *July 12*, 1410.

Roberts, Earl
Yeomanry, Arming of, provision of a Steel Weapon, etc., *July 5*, 614–616.

Roberts, Mr. J. B. [Carnarvonshire, Eifion]
Africa, South—Repatriation of Boers—Detailed Statement of Expenditure, proposed, *July 6*, 786, 787.
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *July 12*, 1411; *July 13*, 1564, 1569, 1570.

Roberts, Mr. J. H. [Denbighshire, W.]
India—Liquor and Drugs, Increasing consumption of—Preventive Legislation *June 29*, 9, 17.
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 63; *July 5*, 737, 739, 749—751, 753, 763, 766; *July 6*, 835; *July 12*, 1449; *July 13*, 1542.
Sweets containing Spirits imported from the Continent, Restricting sale of, proposed, *July 6*, 789.
Tibet Expedition—Cost, Relief of India from payment of, proposed, *July 13*, 1466.

Robertson, Mr. E. [Dundee]
Customs and Excise—New Taxes, Date of enforcing—Interpretation of Section 18 of Customs Consolidation Act, 1876, *June 29*, 20; *July 7*, 957, 958, 959.
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 1224; *July 12*, 1418, 1419, 1426; *July 13*, 1548, 1565.
Navy.
  Boiler Committee, Date of, presenting, Report of, *June 30*, 221.
  Navigation Course—New Scheme—Appointment of Warrant Officers to posts entailing Navigating Duties, proposed, *July 7*, 953.
  Scouts, Information as to, *June 30*, 221.
  Shipbuilding, Programme for 1904–5, Opportunity for Discussing, *June 30*, 220.
  Submarine A.I., Court of Inquiry into loss of, date of, presenting, Report, *June 30*, 221.
Navy Estimates.
  Shipbuilding Resolutions—Financial effect of passing, etc., *June 30*, 212, 213, 215.
  Vote 1 (Armaments) postponement of, proposed, *June 30*, 211.
Supply Services, Issues from Consolidated Fund for, Acts governing, etc., *June 29*, 19, 20.

Robertson, Mr. T. H. [Hackney, S.]
London County Council (General Powers) Bill, *Con.*, *June 29*, 90.

Robinson, Mr. B. [Dudley]
Mines, Animals in, Number of prosecutions for Cruelty to, *July 7*, 947.

Robson, Mr. W. S. [South Shields]
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 110; *July 11*, 1284, 1296.

Roche, Mr. J. [Galway, E.]
Ballinasloe Union Medical Officer, Increase of Salary, refusal of—Reasons, etc., *July 6*, 800, 801.
Ballydonlon Estate, Sale of—Increase in Instalment Rentals—Holding Inspection, etc., *July 4*, 472.
Blakeney Estate, Galway, Agent of, *June 30*, 173; *July 5*, 650.
Clanricarde Estate, Woodford—Tenants' Right to Shooting, *June 30*, 174; *July 4*, 474–476; *July 6*, 795.
Comyn Kenny Estate, Galway, Tenant Purchasers of—Enlarging Uneconomic Holdings, *July 5*, 654.
Kilclooney Burial Ground, Enlargement of—Price asked for Land by Congested Districts Board, *June 30*, 173.
Land Purchase—Untenanted land, question of bonus on, *July 7*, 999.

Rochester, Lord Bishop of
Education (Transferred Schools) Bill, 2R., *July 4*, 426.

Rochford Gas Provisional Order
Report by Board of Trade as to dispensing with consent of Little Stambridge Parish Meeting, presented, *July 13*, 1459.

Rollit, Sir A. K. [Islington, South]
Licensing Bill.
  Borough Recorders, Omission of provision as to, *July 7*, 959.
  Com., *July 6*, 872; *July 13*, 1502, 1529.

Roman Catholics
Transubstantiation, King's Declaration against, *see* Transubstantiation.

Rome
Naval display by British sailors, responsibility for—Sanction of Italian Government &c.
  Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 13*, 1462.

Roscrea
Post Office—Refusal to pay Claim of late Postmaster for Structural Alterations, *Q.* Mr. K. O'Brien; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 11*, 1189–1190.

Rose, Mr. C. D. [Cambridge, Newmarket]
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *July 13*, 1552.

Rosmead, Lord
Militia Ballot System, revival of, *July 11*, 1165.

Rosyth
Naval Works, Progress of, &c.
  Q. Mr. Scott-Montagu; *A.* Mr. A. Lee, *July 13*, 1464, 1465.

Rotherham Corporation Bill
c. 3R.* *July 4*, 438.
l. 1R.* *July 4*, 389.
  2R.* *July 12*, 1325.

Roumania
Trade Report presented, *July 7*, 920.

Roundstone
Flags displayed on licensed premises, prohibition of, by Constables, alleged.
  Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 778.

Royal Irish Constabulary
see Constabulary, Royal Irish.

Runciman, Mr. W. [Dewsbury]
Australia — Import duty on Magazines, alleged notification by Commonwealth Government as to, *July 6*, 780.
Tyneside Tramways and Tramroads Bill, *Con.*, *June 30*, 251.

Russell, Mr. T. W. [Tyrone S.]
Aliens Bill, Abandonment of, *July* 7, 980, 981.
Balance Sheets, Fradulent, Bill to amend Law as to, Date of introducing, *June 4*, 487.
Clanricarde Estate, Woodford — Tenants' Right to Shooting, *July 4*, 475.
Fair Rents.
  Appeals.
    Delays in Hearing, *July 5*, 651.
    Number heard, number outstanding, etc., *July 7*, 989.
  Commissioners engaged on work, number of, *July 7*, 989.
Irish Land Bill, date of taking, *July 5*, 768.
Labourers (Ireland) Act Amendment Bill, Referring to Committee, proposed, *July 6*, 804.
    Motion to Commit to Standing Committee on Trade, *July 8*, 1101.
Land Commission, Report of, delay in presenting, *July 7*, 988.
Land Estates Commissioners—Inspectors, number, religious denominations, etc., *July 13*, 1484.
Land (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 8*, 1126.
Land Judges Court—Inadequate number of Judges—Reasons for non-appointment of Mr. Lynch and Mr. M. O'Brien, *July 7*, 990.
Land Purchase.
  Act of 1896, work done under, *July 7*, 990.
  Estates Commissioners.
    Number of estates purchased by, in Land Judge's Court, etc., *July 7*, 992, 993.
    Staff, Strength of, work accomplished by, etc., *July 7*, 991, 992.
Law Officers of the Crown, Salaries and Fees of, allowing opportunity for discussing, *July 11*, 1199.
Licensing Bill.
  Com. *July 5*, 752; *July 6* 812, 813.
  Procedure Resolution, *July 1*, 379 *July 5*, 702.
Railway.
  Great Northern—Carriage of Parcels from Tynan to Glasgow—Rates Charged, *July 4* 445.
Russo-Japanese War—Seizure of S.S. "Allanton" by Russians — Proposed Government Action, *July 4*, 467–468.

Russia
Behring Sea Seal Fisheries, Protection of, by British Warship — Assent of Japanese and Russian Governments, Question of International Law, etc.
  Qs. Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 7*, 977–979.

[*cont.*

Russia—*cont.*

Trade Report Presented, *July 7*, 920.

Vladivostock, British Commercial Agent at.

Q. Mr. Moon; *A.* Earl Percy, *June 29*, 7.

Russo-Japanese War

"Allanton," S.S., Seizure of, by Russians—Proposed Government Action.
Q. Col. Denny; *A.* Earl Percy, *July 4*, 445–446.
Qs. Mr. Wolff, Mr. J. Devlin, Mr. T. W. Russell; *A.* Earl Percy, *July 4*, 467–468.

Confiscation of Cargo by Russian Prize Court, Reason for, etc.

Qs. Sir C. Cayzer, Mr. Wolff, Mr. J. Devlin; *As.* Earl Percy, *July 7*, 956.

Behring Sea Seal Fisheries, Protection of, by British Warship — Assent of Japanese and Russian Governments, Question of International Law, etc.
Qs. Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 7*, 977–979.

Coaling Belligerent Warships at English Stations.
Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 11*, 1219–1220.

Lessons of—Necessity for Naval Officers having a Knowledge of Japanese and Russian.
Os. Lord Ellenborough, *July 8*, 1072, 1073; Earl of Selborne, 1078.

Mail Steamers, British, Stoppage of, by Russian Warships—Making Inquiry.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Earl Percy, *July 11*, 1204–1205.

Newchwang, Protection of British Subjects at.
Q. Mr. J. Walton; *A.* Earl Percy, *July 4*, 469.

Rutherford, Mr. W. W. [Liverpool, West Derby]

Tyneside Tramways and Tramroads Bill, *Con. June 30*, 253.

Rutland, Duke of

Merchant Shipping Act (1894) Amendment Bill, 2R., *June 30*, 132.

Saddleworth and Springhead Tramways Bill

c. *Con.** and 3R.* *June 29*, 1.
l. 1R.* *June 30*, 117.

St. Asaph, Lord Bishop of

Education (Transferred Schools) Bill, 2R., *July 4*, 393.

St. Helena

Report, Annual, presented, *July 13*, 1458

St. James's Palace

Wine Cellars at, Improvements to, Expenditure on, etc.
Os. Mr. Caldwell, Lord Balcarres, *June 30*, 229.

St. James's Park

Roads, Condition of.
O. Mr. Tennant, *June 30*, 234.

St. Louis Exhibition

Labour Statistics and Charts prepared for, presented, *July 4*, 391 *July 5*, 621.

St. Mary Woolnoth Bill

c. Rep.* *July 1*, 315.
3R.* *July 5*, 618.

Salisbury, Marquess of—*Lord Privy Seal*

Transubstantiation, King's Declaration against—Alteration in Form of Oath proposed, *July 1*, 307, 308, 310.

Salop

Parliamentary By-election—(Western or Oswestry Division)—New Writ, *July 12*, 1368.

Samuel, Mr. H. L. [Yorkshire, Cleveland]

Transvaal.

Chinese Labour, Importation of.

Beri-beri Outbreak, Cause and Extent of, *June 29*, 13–14.

Desertion from Compounds, Arrests for, etc., *July 13*, 1476.

Escape of Coolies from the Camps, alleged, *July 11*, 1203, 1323.

Number of Men, Women and Children Imported, *June 29*, 16, 17; *July 4*, 460; *July 7*, 955.

Recruiting in China.

Contravention of Treaty—Prohibiting Recruiting at Canton, *July 4*, 458–459; *July 11*, 1192.

Hong-Kong, Protection of Coolies Embarked at, *July 4*, 462.

White Labour in Mines—Statistic for April 1004, *June 29*, 9–10.

Workmen's Compensation for Accidents Act Amendment Bill, Date of Introduction of, *June 29*, 20.

Sandhurst Military College

Examination, Preliminary, Fees for.
Q. Sir C. Rasch; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *June 30*, 154–155.

Sassoon, Sir E. A. [Hythe]
County Boroughs with Population below 50,000, Number of, *June 30*, 145.
India — Cable Rate — Obtaining further Reductions, *June 30*, 147–148.
Licensed Premises — Average Annual Value of 1869 Licensed Houses, etc. *July 4*, 447.

Saunderson, Col. Rt. Hon. E. J. [Armagh, N.]
Ballinasloe Asylum, Appointment of Dr. Kirwan as Medical Superintendent of, *July 7*, 1031–1034.
Land (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 8*, 1138.
Licensing Bill Procedure Resolution, *July 1*, 370, 371, 372.
Lurgan—Victoria Street National School Teacher's Salary, *July 13*, 1467.

Savings Banks
Constantinople and Smyrna, Post Office Regulations, Presented, *June 30*, *142*; *July 1*, 266.

Savings Banks Acts Amendment Bill
c. Con. and 3R.* *July 8*, 1143.
l. 1R.* *July 11*, 1148.

Scarisbrick Estate (Amendment) Bill
c. 2R.* *July 11*, 1182.

Schwann, Mr. C. E. [Manchester, N.]
Ceylon, Punishment of Crime in—Substitution of Transportation for Capital Punishment, Proposed, *July 13*, 1473.
India.
  Golden Book of, Official Authority for, *June 30*, 148.
  Panna, Administration of—Reason for Suspending Chief, etc., *June 30*, 159.
Post Office — Engineering Department, Examinations for—Qualifications, Age Limit, etc., of Candidates, *July 8*, 1090.

Scotch Education Department Provisional Order Confirmation (Edinburgh) Bill
l. 3R.* *June 30*, 118.
c. 1R.* *July 4*, 442.
  2R.* *July 12*, 1346.

Scotland
Secretary—Mr. A. Graham Murray.
Lord Advocate—Mr. C. Scott-Dickson.
Lord Justice-General—Lord Kinross.
Vice-President of the Council of Education—Mr. A. Graham Murray.
Aberdeenshire, Absence of Swine Fever in—Reconsidering Regulations imposed.
  Q. Dr. Farquharson; *A.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *June 30*, 163–164.
Allotments—County and Parish Councils, Proceedings of — Return presented, *July 8*, 1089.

Scotland—*cont.*
Children, Employment of—Bye-laws, Number of, sent in by local authorities for confirmation, etc.
  Q. Mr. Tennant; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *July 6*, 775.
Education, *see* Education—Scotland.
Glasgow, Carriage of Parcels from Tynan to—Rates charged.
  Q. Mr. T. W. Russell; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 4*, 445.
Holyrood Palace, condition of, expenditure on improvements, etc.
  Os. Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Caldwell, *June 30*, 229; Lord Balcarres, 230.
Kincardine—Absence of Swine Fever—Reconsidering Regulations imposed.
  Q. Dr. Farquharson; *A.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *June 30*, 163–164.
Parish Charities, granting Return of.
  Q. Mr. Haldane; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *July 11*, 1187–1188.
Paupers, Increase in number of, Inquiry as to Cause of, proposed.
  Q. Mr. A. Cross; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *July 13*, 1461.
Workhouses, Number of Aged Poor as Inmates of, Proportion of, to those receiving Outdoor Relief, Increase in.
  Q. Mr. Black; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *July 11*, 1188–1189.
Rosyth, Naval Works at, Progress of, etc.
  Q. Mr. Scott-Montagu; *A.* Mr. A. Lee, *July 13*, 1464, 1465.
Whaling—Report presented, *July 1*, 266, 317; *July 11*, 1147, 1185.

Scott-Montagu, Mr. G. [Hampshire, New Forest]
Devonport, Visit of German Naval Officers to, Photographs taken of fortifications, etc., *July 13*, 1465.
Hyde Park, Motor Cars in, speed regulations for, *June 30*, 263.
Motors, Number of Accidents caused by, in comparison with those caused by horses and horse-drawn Vehicles, *July 6*, 772.
Parks, Traffic Regulations in—Enforcing Ten-mile Limit for Horse-drawn Vehicles, *July 5*, 645.
Rosyth Base—Progress of Works, *July 13*, 1464.

Sea Fisheries District, North Eastern
Variation of—Order presented, *July 12*, 1326, 1348.

Seal Fisheries
Behring Sea—Protection by British Warship—Assent of Japanese and Russian Governments, Question of International Law, etc.
  Qs. Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 7*, 977–979.

Secondary and Technical Education
see under Education.

Secretary of State for the Colonies
Mr. Alfred Lyttelton.

Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs
Marquess of Lansdowne.

Secretary of State for India
Mr. W. St. John Brodrick.

Secretary for Scotland
Mr. A. Graham Murray.

Secretary of State for War
Mr. H. O. Arnold-Forster.

Seely, Mr. C. H. [Lincoln]
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 1235, 1268, 1291, 1298.

Seely, Maj. J. E. B. [Isle of Wight]
Army.
- Guns—Artillery.
  - Obsolete Character of, *June 30*, 200, 201.
  - Quick-firing Guns, Delay in provision of, *June 30*, 201, 202.
- Rifles, New pattern—Defects, strength of recoil, etc., *June 30*, 200.

Natal Immigration Act (1903), alleged Infringement of, by the "Tweedale," *July 4*, 463.

Transvaal, Importation of Chinese Labour to—Durban, Confining Labourers in Compounds at, *July 4*, 460–461.

Selborne, Earl of—*First Lord of the Admiralty.*
Education (Transferred Schools) Bill, 2R., *July 4*, 432–435.

Interpreters—Increased Facilities and Inducements for Learning Foreign Languages, *July 8*, 1077–1083.

Selby Urban District Council Bill
c. Con. July 4*, 439.
3R.* *July 7*, 943.
l. 1R.* *July 7*, 918

Sessional Orders
No. 11, Interpretation of—Duty of Police to keep a Free Passage for Members to and from the House, Question of Privilege.
Os. Mr. L. Sinclair, Mr. Speaker, *July 6*, 807-809.

Shackleton, Mr. D. J. [Lancashire, Clitheroe]
Army.
- Clothing Factory — Ventilation of Pressing Rooms, *June 29*, 10.
- Rifles, Manufacture of, at Enfield, Birmingham and London, 1889–1894—Sub-contracting, etc., *July 11*, 1196.

Shackleton, Mr. D. G.—*cont.*
Bristol Telegraph Office—Season Substitutes, Rate of Payment of, *July 7*, 948.

Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *July 6*, 836 ; *July 13*, 1516.

Navy Contractors—Fair Wages Resolution and the Employment of Non-union Workmen, *July 13*, 1475.

Shaw, Mr. T. [Hawick Burghs]
Divisions, Members Personally or Pecuniarily Interested in—Liability to have Vote struck off, *July 6*, 911.

Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *July 13*, 1561.

Sheehan, Mr. D. D. [Cork County, Mid.]
Ballingeary, Police Force at—Abolishing Barracks, *June 30*, 166.

Constabulary — Millstreet Barracks — Lodging-out Allowances.
- Abolishing Station as District Head Quarters, *June 29*, 24, 26.
- Names of Constables Occupying Barracks, etc., *July 7*, 971.

Fish-curing Stations on West Coast, Conditions made by Congested Districts Board for Letting, *July 4*, 483.

Warren's Court Estate, Cork, Sale of—Application for Re-instatement from D. Murphy, etc., *July 11*, 1214.

Sheehy, Mr. D. [Meath, S.]
Collierstown—Reinstatement of Frederick Morres, evicted tenant, *July 13*, 1488.

Westropp Estate, Clare.
- Expediting Sale of, *July 5*, 652.
- Offers to tenants, &c., *July 12*, 1363, 1364.

Sherlock Estate, Cork
Purchase of Holdings by Tenants, affording Opportunity for.
Q. Capt. Donelan ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 11*, 1195–1196.

Shinrone, King's County
Evictions at—Case of A. P. Doolan.
Q. Mr. Reddy ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 165–166.

Shipley Urban District Council Bill
c. 3R* *June 29*, 1.
l. Commons' Amendts. *C o.* June 30*, 117.

Shoeburyness
Light Railway, Construction of, Order Authorising, presented, *July 11*, 1147, 1186.

Sidmouth, Viscount
Naval Interpreters—Facilities for studying languages abroad, *July 8*, 1077.

Sinclair, Mr. L. [Essex, Romford]

Duty-Free Spirits—Taking Advantage of Section 8 of Finance Act 1902, *June 29*, 8–9.

Income Tax Abatement for Co-operative Societies, *June 29*, 8.

Privilege, question of—Free passage to and from the House — Interpretation of Sessional Order No. 11, *July 6*, 807, 808, 809.

Skipton Water and Improvement Bill

l. Rep.* *July 1*, 266.
3R.* *July 7*, 918.
c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.* *July 13*, 1457.

Slack, Mr. B. [Hertfordshire, St. Albans]

Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *July 13*, 1529, 1534.

Transvaal, Importation of Chinese Labour to—Sunday Work, Regulations as to, *July 6*, 785.

Whitstable Charities Scheme, Local Opposition to, *July 1*, 317 ; *July 6*, 775, 776 ; *July 7*, 783.

Sligo

Estates purchased by Congested Districts Board in.
Q. Mr. O'Dowd ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 656.

Sloan, Mr. T. H. [Belfast, S.]

Ballinasloe Asylum—Appointment of Dr. Kirwan over the head of Dr. Mills, *July 7*, 1026–1028, 1030.

Ballynahinch, Fishing Rights at—Illegal Interference by Water Bailiffs, alleged, *July 6*, 795.

Belfast.

Police Appointments — Preference given to Roman Catholics, alleged, *July 6*, 777.

Post Office — Money Order Counter Funds, Exhaustion of, *July 4*, 484–485.

Union—Pension of Mr. J. C. Neeson—Amount, Basis of Calculation etc., *July 8*, 1092.

Constabulary, R. I. — Constable Ryan, Reasons for Promotion of, *July 6*, 776.

Dublin.

Metropolitan Police—Reasons for not Promoting Constable T. Whyte, *June 30*, 165.

Patterson, Rev. R. D., Annoyance of, in Public Streets, etc. — Police Protection, *July 4*, 482.

Probates in, Delay in Granting, alleged, *July 7*, 961.

Greencastle Police Force, Re-instating Sergeant Gallagher in Charge of, *July 5*, 653.

Kilrea Sub Post Office—Central Position for New Office, proposed, *July 8*, 1090.

Sloan, Mr. T. H.—*cont.*

Moy District—House to House Inquiry by Police, alleged, *July 7*, 951.

National School Teachers—Promotions—Record of Teachers Promoted 1900–1903, *July 4*, 479.

Railways—Signal Alarm, New Pattern of, Directing Attention of Companies to, *June 30*, 145.

Rome, Naval Display in, by British Sailors —Responsibility, Sanction of Italian Government, etc., *July 13*, 1462.

Roundstone—Flags Displayed on Licensed Premises Prohibited by Constables, alleged, *July 6*, 778.

Smith, Mr. H. C. [Northumberland, Tynesid

Tyneside Tramways and Tramroads Bill, *Con.*, *June 30*, 244, 245.

Smyrna

Post Office Savings Banks Regulations, Presented, *June 30*, 142 ; *July 1*, 266.

Soames, Mr. A. W. [Norfolk, S.]

Education—Religious Instruction, Examinations in—Permission of Local Authority to be Obtained before Suspending School Work, *July 12*, 1349.

Soares, Mr. E. [Devonshire, Barnstaple]

Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 35.

Solicitor-General

Sir E. Carson.

Solicitor-General for Ireland

Mr. J. H. M. Campbell.

Solway Salmon Fisheries Bill

l. 1R.* *July 6*, 921.

Date of Introducing.
Q. Mr. C. Lowther ; *A.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *July 4*, 470–471.

Somaliland

Administration.

Commissioner, Department Directing, etc.
Q. Mr. Bryce ; *A.* Earl Percy *July 6*, 788.

European Staff required, Strength of Garrison, etc.
Qs. Mr. C. Hobhouse ; *As.* Earl Percy, *July 6*, 787, 788.

Mullah — Present Position, Arms and Strength of Following.
Qs. Mr. Lambert ; *A.* Earl Percy, *July 6*, 787.

Q. Mr. Bryce ; *A.* Earl Percy, *July 6*, 788.

Order in Council, Presented, *June 30*, 120, 141.

Soothill Nether Urban District Tramways Bill
- *l.* Report from Select Committee, *July 1*, 265.
  - 3R.* *July 7*, 918.
- *c.* Lords' Amendments, *con.** *July 13*, 1457.

South African War
- Boers, Repatriation of, *see under* Africa, South.
- Guns, Captured, Allotment of, in Great Britain—Refusal of Guns by London County Council, alleged.
  - *Q.* Mr. Coghill; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 7*, 952.
  - *Q.* Mr. Whitmore; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July* 8, 1092, 1093.
- Militia, Services rendered by.
  - *O.* Lord Newton, *July 11*, 1159.

Southend-on-Sea
- Light Railway, Construction of, Order Authorising, Presented, *July 11*, 1147, 1186.

Southend-on-Sea Gas Bill
- *c.* Lords' Amendments, *con.** *July 4*, 438.

Southport and Lytham Tramroad (Extension of Time) Bill
- *c.* *Con.** *July 4*, 439.
  - 3R.* *July 7*, 943.
- *l.* Commons' Amendments, *con.** *July 11*, 1145.

Sowerby
- Parliamentary By-election—New Member Sworn, *July 5*, 659.

Speaker, Mr.
- Central Hall, Crowd in, on 4th inst., alleged, *July 7*, 982.
- Insinuations against Members during Debate, *July 4*, 580.
- Interruptions to Members' Speeches, etc., *July 4*, 578, 579; *July 8*, 1135, 1136.
- Irrelevant Observations, *June 29*, 15; *June 30*, 168; *July 4*, 461, 475; *July 5*, 636, 638; *July 6*, 791, 797; *July 7*, 959, 981; *July 8*, 1096, 1098, 1100; *July 11*, 1212; *July 13*, 1475, 1487, 1490, 1492.
- Licensing Bill.
  - Amendments not in Order, *July 5*, 681, 682.
  - Clauses 3 and 4, Submitting, to a Money Committee, *July 11*, 1223.
  - Irrelevant Matter, Introduction of, *July 1*, 349, 369, 372, 383; *July 4*, 526, 527, 531, 538, 545, 551, 565, 577, 578, 581; *July 5*, 662, 664, 673–675, 677, 708.
  - Unparliamentary Expressions, Abstention from use of, *July 1*, 320; *July 4*, 549.

Speaker, Mr.—*cont.*
- Natal Immigration Act (1903); alleged Infringement of, by the "Tweeddale"—Supplementary Questions as to, *July 4*, 464.
- Navy Estimates—Matter Irrelevant to particular Vote under Discussion, Introduction of, *June 30*, 212–215.
- Personal Attacks on the Leader of the House, not Necessarily out of Order, *July 4*, 577, 579.
- Privilege, Question of—Free Passage for Members to and from the House—Interpretation of Sessional Order No. 11, *July 6*, 808, 809.
- Questions.
  - Answers to, not debateable, *July 7*, 976.
  - Basing on Reports, *July 11*, 1203.
  - Order of, *July 7*, 953.
  - Parliament, Dissolution of — Non-appearance of Question by Mr. S. MacNeill, alleged, *July 7*, 981.
  - Terms of, Placing on the Table in order to determine whether in Order, *July 11*, 1221.
  - Supplementary, Ruling as to, *June 29*, 16, 17; *July 6*, 783.
- Suspension of a Member, Powers as to, *July 5*, 721, 722.

Speaker (House of Lords)
- Powers of.
  - *Os.* Marquess of Ripon, Earl of Halsbury, *June 30*, 121.

Spear, Mr. J. W. [Devon, Tavistock]
- Licensing Bill Procedure Resolution, *July 4*, 556.

Spencer, Earl
- Anderson, Constable, Charges against, and Dismissal from the Force — Tabling Papers relating to, *July 12*, 1344, 1345.
- Compulsory Military Service, Attitude of the Government towards, Speech of Sir N. Lyttelton, etc., *July 11*, 1172–75.
- Education—Pupil Teachers, Training and Supply of, *July 7*, 941.

Spirits
- Distillation in England—Total Quantity distilled in 1903—Quantity used for Methylation, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. W. McKillop; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *July 5*, 641.
- Sweets Imported from the Continent containing, Restrictions on Sale of, proposed.
  - *Qs.* Mr. H. Roberts, Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *July 6*, 789, 790.
- Whiskey, *see that title.*

Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord—*Postmaster-General* [Lancashire, Westhoughton]
- Bristol Telegraph Office — Season Substitutes, Rate of Payment of, *July 7*, 948.
- Cromer—Charge on Letters Addressed to Post Office, *July 7*, 949.
- Engineering Department, Examinations for—Qualifications, Age Limit, etc., *July 8*, 1090.
- Ireland.
  - Ballymena and Londonderry, Establishing Telephone Service between, *June 29*, 6.
  - Bangor—Improvement in Post Office, proposed, *July 13*, 1489.
  - Belfast.
    - Mail Service.
      - London Mails, Delay in Delivery of, *July 4*, 486.
      - Supplementary Service to England, leaving at 6.45 p.m., Authorising, *July 4*, 486.
    - Money Order Counter Funds, Exhaustion of, *July 4*, 484–485.
  - Cork Post Office.
    - Punishments, Disparity in, Alleged, *July 7*, 973, 974.
    - Tracts, Distribution of, by Commander Salwey, Stopping Practice, *June 30*, 177.
  - Dublin—Harcourt Street Postmaster, Salary of, *July 11*, 1217.
  - Enniskillen Post Office — Missing Postal Orders—Refunding Amount to Sender, *June 30*, 176.
  - Fermanagh Co.—Alterations in Mails—Improvement of Present System, Proposed, *July 6*, 791.
  - Irish Language, Examination of Officials in, Proposed—Resolutions Passed by Local Bodies, etc., *July 12*, 1366, 1367.
  - Kerry, Daily Deliveries for Townlands in, *July 4*, 484.
  - Kilrea—Central Position for New Sub-Office, Proposed, *July 8*, 1090.
  - Kinvara—Letter Deliveries, Additional Facilities as to, Proposed, *July 7*, 974.
  - Learners.
    - Age Limit, Regulations as to, *July 7*, 972.
    - Portadown Office, Promotion in, *July 11*, 1190.
  - Limerick, Pay of Postmen in—Increase proposed, *July 7*, 974.
  - Portadown Office, Promotion of Learner in—Making Inquiry, *July 11*, 1190.
  - Roscrea Office—Refusal to Pay Claim of late Postmaster for Structural Alterations, *Feb. 11*, 1190.
  - Sub-postmasters, Remuneration of, *July 1*, 319.

Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord—*cont.*
- Learners.
  - Age limit in Ireland, Regulations as to, *July 7*, 972.
  - Portadown Office, Promotion in—Inquiry Proposed, *July 11*, 1190.
- Letters.
  - Cromer—Extra Charge on Letters Addressed to Post Office, *July 7*, 949.
  - Weighing — Provision of Scales by Department in sub-offices, proposed, *July 1*, 319.
- London.
  - Central Office—Meal Reliefs, Arrangements as to, *July 11*, 1189.
  - Ludgate Circus—Hours of Duty, *July 7*, 949.
- Money Orders—Belfast — Exhaustion of Counter Fund, *July 4*, 485.
- Postmasters.
  - Dublin, Harcourt Street—Salary of Postmaster, *July 11*, 1217.
  - Stony Stratford, Explanation of Appointment to, *July 11*, 1206.
  - Sub-postmasters, Remuneration of, in Ireland, *July 1*, 319.
- Postmen, Pay of, in Limerick—Increase Proposed, *July 7*, 974.
- Stony Stratford, Postmastership of, Explanation of Appointment to, *July 11*, 1206.
- Sub-offices—Scales for Letter-Weighing, Provision of, by Department, Proposed, *July 1*, 319.
- Telegraph Service.
  - Bristol Office, Season Substitutes, Rate of Payment of, *July 7*, 948.
  - Messengers, Appointment of, at Rural Offices, *July 13*, 1463.
  - Telegraphists — Volunteer Annual Inspection, Leave Regulations as to, *July 8*, 1091.
- Telephone Service.
  - Ballymena and Londonderry, establishing between, *June 29*, 6.
  - Villages and Market Towns, Intercommunication between, *July 5*, 642–643.
- Volunteers — Annual Inspection — Leave Regulations for Telegraphists, *July 8*, 1091.
- Wages — Bradford Committee Report Date of Tabling, *July 13*, 1482.

Stanley of Alderley, Lord
- Education — Pupil Teachers, New Regulations as to training of—Shortage of Supply, etc. *July 7*, 936–941.
- Education (Transferred Schools) Bill, 2R., *July 4*, 415, 417, 419, 435.

Stanmore, Lord

Transubstantiation, King's Declaration against—Alteration in form of Oath proposed, *July 1*, 301.

Steel and Iron

see Iron and Steel.

Stevenson, F. S. [Suffolk, Eye]

Turkey, Consular Representation in, Suggested Augmentation of, *July 5*, 640.

Stewart, Sir M. J. McT. [Kirkcudbright.]

Licensing Bill. Procedure Resolution, *July 1*, 342.

Navy, Sunday Observance by—Action of Mediterranean Fleet, *July 4*, 446.

Stirling-Maxwell Sir J M [Glasgow, College]

Education (Scotland) Bill, Date of taking, *June 29*, 10.

Licensing Bill.
Com. June 29, 106; *July 12*, 1440.
Procedure Resolution, *July 4*, 542; *July 5*, 704.

Stony Stratford

Postmastership, Explanation of Appointment to.
Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 11*, 1206.

Strabane

Labourers' Cottages Scheme — Case of Henry McCool.
Q. Mr. McFadden; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 12*, 1365, 1366.

Strachey, Sir E. [Somersetshire, S.]

Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *July 13*, 1510.

Tyneside Tramways and Tramroads Bill, *Con. June 30*, 240.

Stretford Urban District Council Bill

c. 2R.* *June 29*, 2.

Strokestown

Drainage of Rivers in District of.
Q. Mr. J. O'Kelly; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 646.

Submarines

see under Navy.

Sugar

Brussels Convention, Expenditure on, Details of.
Q. Mr. S. Young; *A.* Earl Percy, *July 6*, 788, 789.

Sullivan, Mr. D. [Westmeath, S.]

Ballinagore, Evicted Farm at, Police Protection of Herd on, *June 30*, 148.

Superannuation

Civil Service, *see that title.*

Supply

Consolidated Fund, Issues for Supply Services from, Acts governing, etc.
Qs. Mr. E. Robertson, Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *June 29*, 19–20.

Supreme Court of Judicature (Amendment) Act 1875

Ecclesiastical and Maritime Causes, Registrar in, Order appointing, Presented, *June 30*, 120, 141.

Surrey

Parliamentary By-election — Chertsey Division—New Member sworn, *July 11*, 1224.

Sweets

Spirits contained in Importations from the Continent—Restricting Sale of Sweets proposed.
Qs. Mr. H. Roberts, Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *July 6*, 789-790.

Swindon Corporation Bill

l Report from Select Committee, *July 11*, 1145.

Switzerland

Lace, Counterfeit, made in St. Gall and sold as Irish-made Lace, alleged.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour. *July 13*, 1478.

Talbot, Rt. Hon. J. G. [Oxford University.]

Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *July 6*, 856, 858; *July 12*, 1389.

Tallow

Police—Extra Force Requisitioned for One Day — Reason, Payment of Expenses, etc.
Q. Mr. O'Shee; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 969.

Tankerville, Earl of

Merchant Shipping Act (1894) Amendment Bill, 2R., *June 30*, 132.

Tara, Hill of

Excavations, Steps taken to Prevent.
Qs. Sir T. Esmonde, *July 7*, 1018; Mr. V. Cavendish, 1024.

Taxation

Inquiry into Incidence of, Appointing Select Committee for.
Q. Mr. Channing; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 29*, 31.

Ireland, Cost of Collection in, Details of.
Q. Mr. Lough; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *July 5*, 623-624.

New Taxes, Date of Enforcement by Collecting Departments, Interpretation of Section 18 of Customs Consolidation Act, 1876.
Q. Mr. E. Robertson; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *June 29*, 20.
Qs. Mr. E. Robertson, Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *July 7*, 957, 958, 959.

Taylor, Mr. A. [Liverpool, E. Toxeth]
Licensing Bill, *Com., June* 29, 44, 45, 65, 69 ; *July 5*, 767 ; *July 6*, 814, 858.

Taylor, Mr. T. C. [Lancashire, Radcliffe]
Licensing Bill.
Com., July, 13, 1506, 1533.
Procedure Resolution, *July 5*, 710.

Teachers
See under Education, *also title* National School Teachers, Ireland.

Telegraph Service
Bristol Office, Season Substitutes, rate of payment of.
Q. Mr. Shackleton ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 7*, 948.
Messengers, Appointment of, at Rural Offices.
Q. Mr. Mansfield ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 13*, 1463.
Volunteers—Leave Regulations for Attendance at Annual Inspection.
Q. Capt. Norton ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 8*, 1091.

Telephone Service
Ballymena and Londonderry, Establishing Communication between.
Q. Mr. O' Doherty ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 29*, 6.
Villages and Market Towns, Intercommunication between.
Q. Capt. Bagot ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 5*, 642–643.

Tennant, Mr. H. J. [Berwickshire]
Accident at works of Messrs. Cook—Fencing Machinery, *June 30*, 143.
Children, Employment of — Number of Bye-laws sent in by local authorities in Scotland, etc., *July 6*, 775.
Hyde Park and St. James's Park, condition of roads in, *June 30*, 234.

Thames River
Barrage Scheme, appointing Departmental Committee to consider.
Q. Mr. Crooks ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 11*, 1219.

Thompson, Dr. E. C. [Monaghan, S,]
Army Medical Corps—Promotion of Junior Officer—Communicating Reasons for Selection to Officers passed over, *July 11*, 1197.
Ballinasloe—Salary of Dr. Collins as Medical Officer, *July 13*, 1467.
Education—Hygiene, Instruction in, proposed, *July 13*, 1463.
Estates Commissioners, Work in Office of—Allowing Inspectors to furnish Reports without Minute Particulars, *July 11*, 1193–1194.
Loan Fund Banks, Debenture Holders of, refunding Money lost by, *July 11*, 1193.

Thompson, Dr. E. C.- *cont.*
Omagh—Removal of Street Obstructions, *July 12*, 1350.
Poor Law Medical Officers' Superannuation Bill (Ireland), providing Facilities for Passage of, *July 11*, 1194.
Workhouses, Condition of, in Ireland—Sanitary Improvements and Inspection by Medical men, proposed, *July 12*, 1352.

Thurles Urban District Council Water Bill
l. Rep.* *July 5*, 601.

Tibet Expedition
Armistice, Request for — Empowering British Commander to treat with Negotiators, etc.
Qs. Mr. Lambert, Mr. Flynn ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 4*, 466.
Cost, Payment of—Relief of India, proposed.
Q. Mr. H. Roberts ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick. *July 13*, 1466, 1467.
Progress of Negotiations, character of the expedition, policy of the Government, etc.
Os. Mr. Dalziel, *July 6*, 913 ; Mr. W. Churchill, Mr. Flynn, Mr. S. MacNeill, Mr. Labouchere, 914 ; Mr. Brodrick, 914–916 ; Mr. Lough, 916.
Qs. Mr. G. Bowles, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman ; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 6*, 806.
Qs. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Lough ; *As.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 7*, 955, 956.
Status of Tibet—Chinese Rights—Power to make Treaty with Great Britain.
Q. Mr. Labouchere ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 11*, 1203–1204.

Ticehurst and District Water and Gas Bill
c. 3R.* *July 1*, 315.
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.* *July 4*, 389.

Tillett, Mr. L. J. [Norwich]
Volunteers, Rifle Ranges for — Number constructed since 1899, Cost, etc., *July 6*, 784

"Times, The"
Supply of Copies to Government Departments.
Q. Mr. Markham ; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *June 29*, 5.

Timoleague
Railway, Light, to Ballinsacarthy—County Guarantee of Company, Levying Rate to pay Interest on.
Q. Mr. McFadden ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 631.

Tobacco
  Ireland, Cultivation in—Arrangements for experimental Growing.
    Qs. Mr. D. Morgan, Mr. Flavin; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 798.

Tobacco Duties
  Modifying Budget Proposals.
    Q. Mr. Lambert; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *July 5*, 641–642.
  Stripped Tobacco, etc.
    Date of resumption of Debate on.
      Q. Mr. C. McArthur; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 6*, 804, 805.
    Estimate of Duty on, etc.
      Q. Mr. C. McArthur; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *July 5*, 626–630.

Tomkinson, Mr. J. [Cheshire, Crewe]
  Licensing Bill.
    Com., *July 6*, 811; *July 11*, 1259.
    Procedure Resolution, *July 5*, 710.

Torquay Tramways Bill
  l. Report from Select Committee, *July 12*, 1325.

Trade and Commerce
  Statistical Abstract (1903) for United Kingdom, Date of Publication of.
    Q. Sir J. Leng; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 13*, 1478.

Trade, Board of
  President—Mr. Gerald W. Balfour.
  Parliamentary Secretary—Mr. A. Bonar Law.
  Railway Companies Powers Act, 1864, Report on Proceedings under (1903–4), presented, *June 30*, 120, 140.

Trade Reports
  Annual Series presented, *June 29*, 5; *June 30*, 119; *July 4*, 391, 444; *July 5*, 603; *July 6*, 771; *July 7*, 920, 945; *July 8*, 1054; *July 11*, 1185; *July 12*, 1349.
  Delay in printing, Reasons for, etc.
    Q. Mr. Yoxall; *A.* Earl Percy, *July 1*, 318, 319.
  Index (1903), presented, *July 6*, 771; *July 7*, 920.

Training Colleges
  See under Education.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill
  l. Report from Select Committee, *July 5*, 601.
    *Com.** *July 7*, 919.
    Rep.* *July 8*, 1050.
    3R.* *July 11*, 1146.
  c. 1R.* *July 11*, 1184

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2 Bill
  l. 3R.* *June 30*, 118.
  c. 1R.* *July 4*, 442.
    2R.* *July 13*, 1457.
  Nature of proposals—Memorandum ordere *July 12*, 1349.

Transubstantiation
  King's Declaration against—Alteration i form of words, proposed.
    Os. Duke of Norfolk, *July 1*, 29 301, 309; Earl of Jersey, 275 Archbishop of Canterbury, 279 280, 309; Earl Cowper, 282 Marquess of Ripon, 284, 290, 291 Marquess of Lansdowne, 289 291, 310; Earl of Crewe, 293 308; Bishop of Bristol, 296; Lor Herries, 298; Earl of Halsbury 300, 305; Lord Stanmore, 301 Lord Tweedmouth, 304, 30 307; Duke of Northumberlan 306; Marquess of Salisbury, 307 308, 310; Viscount Halifax, 31

Transvaal
  Administration of
    Native Affairs—Reduction in Numbe of Native Commissioners, etc.
      Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* M Lyttelton, *July 13*, 1477.
    "Self-governing" Colony, Treatmen as, etc.
      Qs. Dr. Macnamara, Mr. Mark ham; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *July 23*, 1489, 1490.
  Affairs of—Correspondence presented, *Jul 4*, 391, 444.
  British Indian Traders in.
    Restrictive Colonial legislation pro jected, alleged.
      Q. Sir M. Bhownaggree; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 8*, 1093 1094.
    Supreme Court of Transvaal, Decision of, Alleged statement of Sir A. Lawley as to, etc.
      Q. Sir M. Bhownaggree; *A* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 30*, 156–157.
  Census, Tabling Summary of—Dutch and English in Pretoria and Johannesburg etc.
    Q. Mr. J. Ellis; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton *July 4*, 454.
  Chinese Labour, Importation of.
    Beri-beri Outbreak.
      Cause and Extent—Date of Out break, etc.
        Qs. Mr. H. Samuel, Dr. Macnamara, Capt. Norton; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton *June 29*, 13–15.
      Delay in receiving Despatches from Lord Milner.
        Qs. Dr. Hutchinson, Mr. C Grant; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 30*, 156.

[*cont.*

Transvaal—*cont.*
Chinese Labour, etc.—*cont.*
Beri-Beri—*cont.*
Telegrams to Lord Milner, Number and Dates of.
Q. Dr. Macnamara; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 4*, 464-465.
"Tweeddale," the, Suggested Discharge of, from Service.
Q. Sir W. Foster; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 4*, 464.
Close Time for Admission of Coolies—Limiting Numbers.
Q. Mr. Lambert; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 4*, 462.
Contract, Tabling Terms of.
Q. Mr. Labouchere; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 4*, 461-462.
Durban.
Confining Labourers in Compounds at, Authority for.
Q. Major Seely; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, Mr. Speaker, *July 4*, 460-461.
Landing Coolies at—Lord Milner's Report.
Qs. Dr. Macnamara; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, Mr. Speaker, *June 29*, 15-16 *July 13*, 1477.
Escape and Capture of two coolies, alleged.
Qs. Mr. S. MacNeill; Mr. Lyttelton, *July 8*, 1143, 1144.
Qs. Mr. S. MacNeill, *July 11*, 1321, 1322; Mr. H. Samuel, Mr. Lyttelton, 1323; Mr. H. J. Wilson, Mr. Flavin, Mr. Cremer, 1324.
Qs. Mr. S. MacNeill, Mr. H. Samuel; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 11*, 1202, 1203.
Qs. Mr. H. Samuel, Dr. Macnamara, Mr. S. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 13*, 1476, 1477.
Number of Men, Women and Children imported.
Qs. Dr. Macnamara, Mr. Lloyd-George, Mr. H. Samuel; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, Mr. Speaker, *June 29*, 16-17.
Qs. Dr. Macnamara, Mr. S. Buxton, Mr. H. Samuel; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 4*, 459-460.
Q. Mr. H. Samuel; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 7*, 955.
Recruiting in China.
Advertisements in *Chinese Times*, False Impression given by—Authority responsible, etc.
Qs. Mr. S. Buxton, Mr. C. Allen; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 29*, 12-13.

Transvaal—*cont.*
Chinese Labour, etc.—*cont.*
Recruiting in China—*cont.*
Contravention of Treaty—Prohibiting recruiting at Canton.
Qs. Mr. H. Samuel; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July*, *4*, 458, 459; *July 11*, 1192.
Hong-kong, Protection of Coolies embarked at.
Q. Mr. H. Samuel; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 4*, 462.
Tientsin, Disturbances at—Preventing Future Disturbances.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 11*, 1198-1199.
Sunday work, Regulations as to.
Qs. Mr. Slack, Mr. Markham, Mr. Lough, Mr. Whitley; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 6*, 785, 786.
"Tweeddale," Debarkation of Coolies from, Tabling Report of.
Q. Dr. Macnamara; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 4*, 462-463.
Unskilled Labour, Confining Chines to—Comet Mine Overseers.
Q. Mr. Markham; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 11*, 1201-1202.
Wives and children, Facilities for introduction of—Number registered.
Qs. Lord Coleridge, *July 5*, 616 Duke of Marlborough, 617.
Constabulary—Strength, Cost, Transvaal contribution, &c.
Qs. Sir C. Dilke; *As.* Mr Lyttelton, *June 29*, 17; *July 6*, 784, 785.
Explosives Tax—Saving in 1903 as compared with 1899, etc.
Qs. Mr. Whitley, Mr. Markham; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, Mr. Speaker, *July 5*, 638.
Finance.
Correspondence presented, *June 29*, 4; *June 30*, 119.
Debate on, Tabling Proceedings of Inter-Colonial Council previous to, etc.
Q. Mr. Buchanan; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 5*, 639-640.
Labour Question.
Chinese Labour, Importation of, *see that sub-heading.*
Native Labour in Mines.
Comparison with number of white labourers.
Q. Dr. Macnamara; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 12*, 1356.
Statistics for March, April, May, 1904.
Qs. Mr. S. Buxton; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 30*, 153; *July 4*, 456, 457.

[*cont.*

Transvaal—*cont.*
  Labour Question—*cont.*
    White labour in Mines
      Comparison with number of coloured laboures.
        Q. Dr. Macnamara; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton *July 12*, 1356.
      Statistics for April 1904.
        Q. Mr. H. Samuel; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 29*, 9–10.
  Mines.
    Gold output, Statistics as to.
      Q. Dr. Macnamara; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 12*, 1356.
    Johannesburg, Kaffir Compounds at, Police Raid on, etc.
      Q. Dr. Macnamara; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 30*, 152–153.
    Labour in, *see under sub-headings* Chinese Labour *and* Labour Question.
  Legislative Council.
    Changes in Constition proposed.
      Qs. Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Lambert; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 5*, 639.
    Names of Members of, with Official Positions or Avocations, etc.
      Q. Mr. J. Ellis; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 4*, 454–456.
  Milner, Lord, Conspiracy to Murder—Arrests, etc.
    Q. Mr. L. Morgan; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 30*, 155, 156.
  Representative Government, Communications as to Grant of.
    Q. Mr. Lambert; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *July 4*, 465.

Trawling
  Ireland, Muir Bay—Trawling within prohibited area alleged, Date of visit of the "Granuaile," &c.
    Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 799.

Treasury
  First Lord—Mr. A. J. Balfour.

Trevelyan, Mr. C. P. [Yorkshire, W.R., Elland]
  Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *July 13*, 1502, 1509.

Trinity College, Dublin
  See under Dublin.

Tritton, Mr. C. E. [Lambeth, Norwood]
  Licensing Bill Procedure Resolution, *July 4*, 532; *July 5*, 700.

Tuberculosis
  Animals, in.
    Bye-laws, model, number of local authorities adopting, means of enforcing adoption, &c.
      Q. Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *July 12*, 1358, 1359.
    Meat, Inspection of—Qualifications of Inspectors, &c.
      Qs. Mr. Lundon, Mr. Kilbride; *As.* Mr. Long, *July 12*, 1359, 1360.

Tuberkeen, Dungloe
  Evictions—Application of G. Ward for Reinstatement.
    Qs. Mr. H. Law; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 452; *July 7*, 967.

Turkey
  Consular Representation in, suggested Augmentation of.
    Q. Mr. Stevenson; *A.* Earl Percy, *July 5*, 640.

Tweedmouth, Lord
  Army—Staff officers, deficiency in number of, *July 8*, 1070.
  Education (Transferred Schools) Bill, 2R., *July 4*, 403, 405, 406, 434.
  Transubstantiation, King's Declaration against—alteration in form of oath proposed, *July 1*, 304, 305, 307.
  Yeomanry, Arming of, provision of a steel weapon, etc., *July 5*, 612–614.

Tynan
  Carriage of parcels to Glasgow—Rates charged.
    Q. Mr. T. W. Russell; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 4*, 445.

Tyne
  Channel Fleet, suggested Visit of.
    Q. Mr. Renwick; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *June 30*, 153.

Tynemouth Corporation Bill
  c. Rep.* *July 1*, 315.
    Con. *11*, 1182.

Tyneside Tramways and Tramroads Bill
  c. Con. June 30, 234.

Uganda
  Estimates for Service of, obtaining, by Members.
    Q. Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Earl Percy, *July 5*, 641.
  Additional particulars proposed.
    Q. Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Earl Percy; *O.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 7*, 956.

Ulster
  Party Demonstration in—Maintenance of Public Peace.
    Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 29*, 22.

Ulster Electric Power Bill
  l. Bill not to be proceeded with, *July 8*, 1049.

Unemployed
  see under Working Classes

United States

Abyssinia, Commercial Treaty with.
Q. Major Evans Gordon; *A.* Earl Percy, *June 29*, 7.

Irish-Cured Fish, Import duty on—Inducing withdrawal, proposed.
Qs. Mr. T. O'Donnell, Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 6*, 794.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 967.

Trade Report presented, *June 30*, 1119; *July 5*, 603; *July 7*, 920.

Universities

Ireland.
Royal University—Degree of Bachelor of Arts—Number of Candidates from Queen's Colleges (1899–1903)
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 13*, 1460–1462, 1482.
Trinity College, *see under* Dublin.

University of Liverpool Bill

c. 1R.* *July 7*, 983.

Urban District Councils

Chairman's Power of Voting.
Q. Mr. Parrott; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *July 5*, 622.

Vaccination

Calf Lymph, Cost of Procuring—Disposal of Calves—Lymph Veal, etc.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *July 5*, 644–645.

Valentia Ferry

Improvement of—Delay in Formulating Scheme, alleged.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 7*, 966, 967.

Valuation (No. 2) Bill

c. 1R.* *June 30*, 181.

Vans

Covered, Accidents with—Comparison of Figures May 1903 and 1904—Infringement of New Bye-Law.
Q. Sir T. Dewar; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 4*, 447.

Venezuela

Trade Report Presented, *July 5*, 603.

Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H. [Sheffield, Central]

Army, Re-armament of, Progress made with, *June 30*, 187.

Volunteers.
Camping out—Return of a Brigade in 1900 in Consequence of Rain, *July 4*, 458.
Field Guns for Artillery, Date of Supplying, *June 30*, 187.
Unemployed, Effect of Unrestricted Alien Immigration on Numbers of, etc., *July 11*, 1218.

Vladivostock

British Commercial Agent at.
Q. Mr. Moon; *A.* Earl Percy, *June 29*, 7.

Volunteers

Artillery—Field Guns, Date of Supplying.
Qs. Sir C. Dilke, *June 30*, 182; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 185; Sir J. Colomb, 186; Sir H. Vincent, 187.

Camping out—Return of a Brigade in 1900 in Consequence of Rain, alleged.
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July* 4, 458.

C.I.V.—Conditions of Service in S. Africa.
Q. Sir J. Colomb; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *June 30*, 152.

Naval, Granting Allowance to Meet Expense of Instruction for.
Q. Mr. Kearley; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *June 30*, 144–145.

Retired—Number Efficient for not less than Three Years.
Q. Mr. C. Allen; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *July 6*, 784.

Rifle Ranges for—Number Constructed since 1899, Cost, etc.
Q. Mr. Tillett; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 6*, 784.

Telegraphists — Leave Regulations for Attendance at Annual Inspection.
Q. Capt. Norton; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 8*, 1091.

Wales

County Courts—Plaints, Number of, in 1903—Return Ordered, *June 30*, 142.

Wallace, Mr. R. [Perth]

Aliens Bill, Abandonment of, *July 7*, 980.

Waltham Abbey and Cheshunt Gas Provisional Order

Report by Board of Trade as to Dispensing with Consent of Cheshunt Urban District Council, Presented, *July 13*, 1459.

Walton, Mr. Joseph [Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley]

Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 45.

Russo-Japanese War—Newchwang, Protection of British Subjects at, *July 4*, 469.

Walton, Mr. J. L. [Leeds, S.]

Licensing Bill.
Com., *June 29*, 70, 88; *July 12*, 1403, 1407, 1430, 1431, 1434, 1435; *July 13*, 1565, 1566.
Procedure Resolution, *July 1*, 357.

War Office

Secretary of State—Mr. H. O. Arnold-Forster.

Under Secretary—Earl of Donoughmore.

Financial Secretary—Mr. W. Bromley-Davenport.

Warner, Mr. T. C. T. [Staffordshire, Lichfield]
Army—Rifles, Relative cost of Manufacture of, by the Government and the Trade, *June 30*, 195.
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *July 13*, 1512.

Warren's Court Estate, Cork
Sale of—Application for Re-instatement from D. Murphy, etc.
Q. Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 11*, 1214.

Washington
Trade Report Presented, *July 7*, 920.

Wason, Mr. E. [Clackmannan and Kinross]
Agriculture, Average Annual Profits from, in Great Britain, *July 11*, 1207–1208.

Wason, Mr. J. C. [Orkney and Shetland]
Africa, East.
Administration of.
Eliot, Sir C., Resignation of.
Inquiry Proposed, *July 4*, 455.
Tabling papers as to, proposed, *July 7*, 979.
Hopton, Mr., Reason for Dismissal of, *July 5*, 640.
Alien Settlement — Conditions of Grant—Tabling papers, proposed, *July 7*, 979.
Estimates for Service of, Obtaining, by Members, *July 5*, 641.
Additional particulars, proposed, *July 7*, 957.
Licensing Bill.
Penalties for not providing Reasonable Refreshment — Complying with Requirements of Magistrates, *July 11*, 1220.
Procedure Resolution, *July 4*, 580, 581.
Value of Premises involved, etc., *June 30*, 162; *July 4*, 469.
Motor Cars in London, Speed Regulations for, *July 7*, 960.
Uganda, Estimates for Service of, Obtaining, by Members, *July 5*, 641.
Zanzibar.
Minority of Sultan, Arrangements for direction of affairs during, *July 7*, 950.
Regent of, Complaints as to Proceedings of, etc., *July 11*, 1204.

Water Orders Confirmation Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *July 5*, 601.
Com.,* *July 7*, 919.
Rep.,* *July 8*, 1050.
3 R.,* *July 11*, 1146.
c. 1R.* *July 11*, 1184.
Nature of Proposals—Memorandum ordered, *July 13*, 1460.

Wei-hai-Wei
Coaling accommodation for the Navy, Provision of.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *June 30*, 219; Mr. Pretyman, 219, 220.
Expenditure on—Retention of, as a Naval Station, etc.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *June 30*, 218; Mr. Pretyman, 219.
Report, Annual, Presented, *July 8*, 1054, 1089.

Weir, Mr. T. G. [Ross and Cromarty]
Fisheries, North Sea—Investigation, inducing French Government to take part in, *June 30*, 143.

Wemyss, Earl of
Merchant Shipping Act (1894) Amendment Bill, 2R., *June 30*, 135.
Militia.
Compulsory Service — Recommendations of the Norfolk Commission, etc., *July 11*, 1150–1156, 1178.
State of, Deficiency in Establishment, etc., *July 11*, 1148–1157, 1180.
Yeomanry—Lovat Scouts, Position, Armament, &c.—Postponement of Motion, *July 4*, 392.

Wescott, Capt.
Imprisonment of, at Vera Cruz, by order of the Mexican Government—Compensation Claim, Steps taken by H.M. Government to enforce, etc.
Os. Lord Muskerry, *July 7*, 923; Marquess of Lansdowne, 926, 927.

West Ham
Board of Guardians, Proposed Purchase of Forest Gate Barrack School by, alleged.
Qs. Mr. Lough; *As.* Mr. G. Lawson, *July 13*, 1481, 1482.

West Riding Tramways Bill
c. Rep.* *July 7*, 943.

Westropp Estate, Clare
Sale of.
Expediting.
Q. Mr. Sheehy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 5*, 652.
Land Judge, Action of, in delaying.
O. Mr. Cullinan, *July 7*, 986.
Offers to Tenants, &c.
Qs. Mr. Sheehy; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 12*, 1363, 1364.

Whaling
Scotland—Report presented, *July 1*, 266, 317; *July 11*, 1147, 1185.

Wharton, Rt. Hon. J. L. [York, West Riding, Ripon]
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *July 12*, 1371, 1412; *July 13*, 1500, 1505, 1508, 1556, 1564.

Whiskey
Bond, Spirits in—Official knowledge of nature of contents of all casks, &c.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *July 13*, 1481.
Pot Still and Patent Still Whiskey, Separation of, in Annual Revenue Returns, proposed.
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *July 13*, 1480, 1481.

White, Mr. G. [Norfolk, N.W.]
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *July 13*, 1556, 1157.

Whiteley, Mr. G. [Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey]
Licensing Bill, *Com. July 13*, 1517.

Whitley, Mr. J. H. [Halifax]
Finance Bill, Date of Resuming Discussion on, *June 29*, 33, 34.
Hyde Park, Motor Cars in, Speed Regulations for, *June 30*, 264.
Licensing Bill.
Com. June 29, 44, 66, 100, 101; *July 5*, 759; *July 6*, 810, 846; *July 12*, 1372, 1443, 1450; *July 13*, 1500, 1541.
Procedure Resolution, *July 5*, 674, 675.
Palaces, Royal, Cost of Maintenance and Repairs of, *June 30*, 228.
Transvaal.
Chinese Labour, Importation of—Sunday Work, Regulations as to, *July 6*, 786.
Explosives Tax—Saving in 1903 as compared with 1899, etc., *July 5*, 638.

Whitmore, Mr. C. A. [Chelsea]
Guns Captured in South African War, etc., Allotment of, in Great Britain—Refusal of Guns by London County Council, Alleged, *July 8*, 1092.

Whitstable
Charities Scheme, Local Opposition to, etc.
Qs. Mr. Slack; *As.* Mr. G. Boscawen, *July 1*, 317; *July 6*, 775, 776.
Q. Mr. Slack; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *July 7*, 950.

Whittaker, Mr. T. P. [York, W. R., Spen Valley
Divisions, Members Personally or Pecuniarily interested in—Liability to have Vote Struck off, *July 6*, 912.
Licensing Bill.
Com. June 29, 43, 55, 76, 109; *July 6*, 811, 888; *July 11*, 1244; *July 12*, 1374, 1376, 1393, 1401, 1433, 1437, 1438; *July 13*, 1519, 1541.
Procedure Resolution, *July 1*, 365, 370; *July 4*, 511.

Wicklow Camp
Canteen Licence, Action of Mr. J. Shanks in Signing.
Qs. Mr. J. O'Connor; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 30*, 170–171; *July 11*, 1215.

Williams, Mr. A. O. [Merionethshire]
Licensing Bill, *Com. July 12*, 1398.

Willoughby de Broke, Lord
Yeomanry.
Arming of, Deficiencies in—Objections to the Bayonet, etc., *July 5*, 608–610.
Position of, as a mounted force, *July 5*, 609.

Willoughby de Eresby, Lord [Lincolnshire, Horncastle]
Licensing Bill, *Com. July 11*, 1289.

Wilson, Mr. H. J. [Yorkshire, W.R., Holmfirth]
Transvaal, Importation of Chinese Labour to—Escape and Capture of two coolies, alleged, *July 11*, 1324.

Wilson, Mr. J. W. [Worcestershire, N.]
London County Council (General Powers) Bill, *Con.*, *June 29*, 96.

Wishaw Corporation Order Confirmation Bill
l. 3R.* *June 30*, 118.
c. Con. July 6*, 769.
3R.* *July 8, 1085.*

Witney
Light Railway, Construction of, Order authorising, presented, *July 11*, 1147, 1186.

Wolff, Mr. G. W. [Belfast, E.]
"Allanton," S.S., Seizure of, by Russians—
Proposed Government Action, *July 4*, 467.
Confiscation of cargo by Russian Prize Court, Reasons for, etc., *July 7*, 956.
Business of the House, Course of, *July 7*, 980.

Wolverhampton Corporation Bill
l. 3R.* *June 30*, 117.
c. Lords' Amendments, *Con.* July 8*, 1085.

Wolverton, Lord
Merchant Shipping Act (1894) Amendment Bill.
2R., *June 30*, 130.
3R., *July 7*, 923.
Nautical Charities, Number, Administration, etc., of—Return proposed, *July 1*, 268.
Railways (Private Sidings) Bill, 2R., *July 5*, 603.

Wood, Mr. J. [Down, E.]
Ballykinlor Camp, Meat Tenders for—Reasons for not accepting lowest Tender, *July 11*, 1198.
Portadown Post Office, Promotion of Learner in—Making Inquiry, etc., *July 11*, 1190.

Woodhouse, Sir J. T. [Huddersfield]
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 112; *July 5*, 766; *July 6*, 809, 863, 865, 875; *July 13*, 1505, 1539-1541.
Tyneside Tramways and Tramroads Bill, *Con.*, *June 30*, 234, 245, 249, 257.

Woods, Forests and Land Revenues
Commissioners, Report of (1903-4); Presented, *June 30*, 120, 141.

Workhouses
Ireland.
Classification of, Basis of.
Q. Mr. Reddy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 4*, 476.
Glenties — Improvement in Sanitary Arrangements, proposed.
Q. Dr. Thompson; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 12*, 1352.
Naas Union—Destruction of Whiskey polluted by Addition of Impure Water — Refunding Duty proposed.
Q. Mr. Leamey; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 12*, 1354, 1355.
Sanitary Condition—Improvement and inspection by Medical Men, proposed.
Q. Dr. Thompson; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 12*, 1352.
Scotland—Aged Poor, Number of, as Inmates, Proportion of, to those Receiving Outdoor Relief, Increase in.
Q. Mr. Black; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *July 11*, 1188-1189.

Working Classes
Unemployed, Dealing with Question of, during Recess—Effect of Unrestricted Alien Immigration, etc.
Qs. Mr. Crooks, Sir H. Vincent, Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 11*, 1218-1219.

Workmen's Compensation for Accidents Act Amendment Bill
Date of Introduction.
Q. Mr. H. Samuel; *A.* Mr. Cochrane, *June 29*, 20-21.
Trades affected by.
Q. Sir T. Dewar; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 4*, 470.

Works
First Commissioner—Lord Windsor.

Works, Board of, Ireland
Constitution and Administration of.
O. Sir T. Esmonde, *July 7*, 1017.
Grand Canal Company, Dispute with.
Os. Sir T. Esmonde, *July 7*, 1018; Mr. V. Cavendish, 1024.
Loans, Delay in dealing with applications for, Rate of Interest, etc.
Os. Sir T. Esmonde, *July 7*, 1020; Mr. V. Cavendish, 1023.
Piers and Harbours, discontinuance of Grants for.
Os. Sir T. Esmonde, *July 7*, 1021; Mr. V. Cavendish, 1023.

Works Loan Board, Public
Report, Annual, Presented, *July 4*, 392, 444.

Workshops
see Factories and Workshops.

Worsley-Taylor, Mr. H. W. [Lancashire, Blackpool]
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *July 13*, 1499, 1511.

Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. S.—*Temporary Chairman of Committees* [Sheffield, Hallam]
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 105; *July 12*, 1404.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*Chief Secretary for Ireland* [Dover]
Agricultural and Technical Instruction Department.
Munster Dairy School—Delay in carrying out Improvements, *July 5*, 649.
Officers' Salaries and Travelling Expenses, *June 29*, 23.
Organisation Society, Annual Amount paid to, etc., *June 29*, 22; *July 6*, 792, 793.
Peat-produced Gas, establishing Industry of, *July 4*, 450.
Small Industries, Development of, *June 30*, 173.
Veterinary Branch—Roman Catholic Clerks' Position, Pensions of, etc., *June 30*, 170; *July 6*, 801.
Vice-president, Position of, as Member of Government and House of Commons, etc., *June 30*, 178-179.
Winter dairying, promotion of, *July 4*, 472-473.
Annascaul—Valuation of Mr. O'Donnell's Lands—Refunding Excess Taxation, *July 4*, 452-453.
Antrim, Clerk of the Peace, Amalgamating Office of, with that of Belfast, saving effected by, etc., *July 5*, 652.
Ballinacross, Farm of Mr. J. Robinson at—Application for Sale, *July 6*, 776.

[*cont.*

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*
- Ballinagore, Evicted Farm at, Police Protection of Herd on, *June 30*, 148.
- Ballinasloe.
  - Asylum—Appointment of Dr. Kirwan, *July 7*, 1041, 1042.
  - Union Medical Officer, Salary of—Reason for refusal of increase, *July 6*, 800 ; *July 13*, 1467.
- Ballingeary, Police Force at—Abolishing Barracks, *June 30*, 166.
- Ballydonlon Estate, Galway, Sale of—Increase in Instalment Rentals—Holding Inspection, etc., *July 4*, 472.
- Ballymacrossin Estate, Sale of—Re-instatement of evicted tenant, *July 7*, 963, 964.
- Ballymahan, Inspection of Weights and Measures at, Selecting convenient time for, *June 29*, 26.
- Ballynaclosha National School—Income of Principal Teacher, *July 4*, 449 ; *July 5*, 630.
- Ballynahinch, Fishing Rights at—Illegal interference by Water Bailiffs, alleged, *July 6*, 795.
- Bateman Estate, Tralee—Demand for Gale Rents—Forcing Tenants to accept Landlord's Terms, etc., *June 30*, 167–169.
- Bawnboy—Mr. Humphreys' Tenants, Recovery of Rent from—Judgments set aside—Protection of Tenants, etc., *July 4*, 477.
- Belfast.
  - Children's Court, Establishment of, *July 7*, 962.
  - Clerk of the Peace, Amalgamating Office of, with that of Antrim, Saving effected by, etc., *July 5*, 652.
  - Dee Street, Insanitary Condition of, *July 4*, 484.
  - Infectious Diseases, Outbreaks of—
    - Refuse, Disposal of, on building ground, Prohibition of, proposed, etc., *June 29*, 28 ; *July 6*, 797, 798.
    - Small-pox Outbreak—Negligence of City Council—Bringing Pressure to bear on Council, etc., *June 29*, 28.
  - Kelvin House—Bachelor of Arts Degree, Number of successful candidates from 1899–1903, *July 13*, 1461, 1462, 1482.
  - Police Appointments — Preference given to Roman Catholics, alleged, *July 6*, 777.
  - Queen's College.
    - Bachelor of Arts Degree, Number of candidates taking, from 1899-1903, *July 13*, 1461 1462, 1482.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*
- Belfast—*cont.*
  - Queen's College—*cont.*
    - Professors, Appointments held by, Lectures abandoned for lack of Audience, etc., *July* 12, 1362, 1363.
    - Scholarships, Lapsed — Number, cause of lapse, etc., *July 13*, 1483.
    - Session, Duration of, *July 12*, 1362, 1363.
  - Union—Pension of Mr. J. C. Neeson—Amount, Basis of calculation, etc., *July 8*, 1092.
- Blacklion Dispensary, Improvement in condition of, proposed, *July 6*, 800.
- Blakeney Estate, Galway, Agent of, etc., *June 30*, 173–174 ; *July 5*, 650.
- Blennerhassett Estate, Kerry.
  - Banks, Upkeep of, Authority responsible for, etc., *June 29*, 27.
  - Evicted Tenant, Reinstatement of, *July 6*, 795.
- Burtonport Railway—Gross Earnings per Mile per Week, etc., *June 30*, 149.
- Butter, Salt Firkin—Number of Prosecutions for excessive moisture, *July 13*, 1486, 1487.
- Cappawhite, Withdrawal of, from sale of Estate of Thomas Dowling, *July 7*, 965.
- Carnane Estate, Sale of proposed—Addition of owner's name in order to identify estate, *July 7*, 963.
- Castleblaney Union, Labourers' Cottages in—Arbitrator's Award for Land—Alleged interested Decision, etc., *June 29*, 25, 26.
- Children's Courts, Number of, established, *July 7*, 962.
- Clanricarde Estate — Game rights of tenants, *June 30*, 174 ; *July 4*, 474, 476 ; *July 6*, 796, 797.
- Coleraine, Publican at, Alleged Police Persecution of, *June 30*, 169.
- Collierstown — Evicted tenant, Reinstatement of, *July 13*, 1489.
- Comyn Kenny Estate, Galway, Tenant Purchasers of—Enlarging uneconomic Holdings, *July 5*, 655.
- Congested Districts Board.
  - Clerkships, Temporary, Examination System for, Reason for Abolishing, *July 5*, 658.
  - Fish-curing Stations on West Coast, Conditions for letting, *July 4*, 483.
  - Kerry, South, Number of Estates offered for Sale in—Price demanded, etc., *July 4*, 479.
  - Kilclooney Burial Ground, Price asked for Land to Enlarge, *June 30*, 173.
  - Listellick Farm, Kerry, Purchase of, *June 30*, 169.
  - Number of Estates Purchased by, *July 7*, 1001.

[*cont.*

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*
- Congested District Board—*cont.*
  - Rae Estate, Kerry, Proposed Purchase of, *June 30*, 174 ; *July 12*, 1366.
  - Sligo, Estates Purchased in—Purchase Money, Gross Rentals, etc., *July 5*, 624, 656.
- Constabulary, Royal Irish.
  - Anderson, Constable—Charges Against, and Dismissal from the Force.
    - Correspondence Relating to, Furnishing Copies of, *July 13*, 1486.
    - Discussion of—Arrangements as to, *July 7*, 1040, 1041, 1046.
    - Macdonnell, Sir A., Insinuations against, *June 29*, 29–31 ; *July 7*, 1041.
  - Ballinagore, Protection of Herd at, *June 30*, 148.
  - Ballingeary, Force at — Abolishing Barracks, *June 30*, 166.
  - Belfast Appointments — Preference given to Roman Catholics, alleged, *July 6*, 777.
  - Greencastle Force, Re-instating Sergeant Gallagher in charge of, *July 5*, 653–654.
  - Millstreet Barracks — Lodging-out Allowances.
    - Abolishing Station as District Head Quarters, etc., *June 29*, 25, 26.
    - Names of Constables Occupying Barracks, etc., *July 7*, 971.
  - Molloy, Constable, Alleged Threatening of Witness by—Date of Report, etc., *July 5*, 652 ; *July 7*, 966.
  - Moy District, House-to-house Inquiry in, alleged, *July 7*, 952.
  - Naughten, Martin, Arrest of—Examination of Arresting Constable, *June 30*, 151.
  - Punishment of—Number Punished at Instance of County Inspector Ball, *July 12*, 1351.
  - Roundstone — Flags Displayed on Licensed Premises Prohibited by Constables, alleged, *July 6*, 778.
  - Ryan, Constable, Reasons for Promotion of, *July 6*, 777.
  - Tallow, extra force requisitioned at, for one day—Reason, payment of Expense, etc., *July 7*, 969.
- Cork.
  - Children's Court, Establishment of *July 7*, 962.
  - Queen's College—Bachelor of Arts degree, Number of Candidates taking from 1899–1903, *July 13*, 1461, 1462, 1482.
- Dernageas Farm, Longford, Suggested purchas of, to enlarge Small Holdings, etc, *June 29*, 22.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon .G.—*cont.*
- Derrygoolan Estate—Tenants' Rights to Shooting—Police Interference, *July 11*, 1211–1212.
- Development Grant Bill—Petty Sessions Clerks' Fund, transferring Credit Balance to Treasury, withdrawing Clause as to, *July 5*, 650.
- Development Grant Fund—Date of Presenting Estimate, etc., *July 7*, 965.
- Dingle—Valuation Error in holding of Thomas O'Donnell, alleged—Refunding money, proposed, *July 7*, 970, 971.
- Donegal.
  - Crimelessness of — Revoking Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act, 1881, *June 30*, 149.
  - Homespun, Sale of Inferior Materials as, alleged, *July 13*, 1488.
  - Marine Works Act, Allocation of Money under, *July 5*. 632–633.
- Dowling, Thomas, Sale of Estate of—Terms of Sale, Withdrawal of Village of Cappawhite, etc., *July 7*, 965.
- Down County, Principal Teacher of—Claim to Increment of Salary, *July 4*, 451.
- Dublin.
  - Children's Court, Establishment of, *July 7*, 962.
  - Metropolitan Police—Reason for not Promoting Constable T. Whyte, *June 30*, 165.
  - Patterson, Rev. R. D., Annoyance of, in Public Streets, &c.—Police Protection, *July 4*, 482–483.
  - Phœnix Park—Exclusion of National Games—Preference given to Polo and Cricket, *June 30*, 172–173.
- Education.
  - Intermediate.
    - Commission of Inquiry—Constitution, Terms of Reference, &c., *July 12*, 1361, 1362.
    - Inspection, Establishing System of, *July 5*, 649, 650.
    - Visits of Messrs. Dale and Stevens to Schools—Reason for Dr. Starkie's Presence, *July 11*, 1211.
  - Irish Language, Payment for instruction in, *July 13*, 1485.
  - Keelnabrach School, Dangerous state of, Alleged—Delay in building new school, &c., *July 13*, 1485.
  - Knocknagin, Delay in erecting school at, *July 7*, 951.
  - Lettir (Kerry)—Delay in producing plans for new school, Alleged, *July 13*, 1484.
  - Schoolhouse plans and estimates, Delay in sanctioning alleged, *July 7*, 966.

[*cont.*

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*
- Education—*cont.*
  - Secondary and Technical — Officials employed, Granting Return of, *July 5*, 648.
  - University Education, Granting Return as to, *July 4*, 480-481.
  - Woodwork Instruction, Training Teachers for—Object of course, etc., *June 29*, 23–24.
- Enniskillen.
  - Dispensary Districts — Submitting records to Guardians, *July 4*, 478.
  - Fair Rents—Date of Appeal Sittings, *July 4*, 476.
- Evictions.
  - Ballinagore, Farm at, Police Protection of Herd on, *June 30*, 148.
  - Ballymacrossin estate—Reinstatement of evicted tenant, *July 7*, 963, 964.
  - Blennerhassett Estate, Sale of—Reinstatement of evicted tenant, *July 6*, 795.
  - Collierstown — Reinstatement of F. Morres, *July 13*, 1489.
  - Galway, Number of Applications and Reinstatements in, *July 11*, 1213, 1214.
  - Macgillicuddy Estate—Reinstatement of evicted tenant, *July 6*, 794.
  - Rattigan's Estate, Edgeworthstown, on — Attitude of Tenants, etc., *June 29*, 21.
  - Shinrone, King's County, Evictions at —Case of A. P. Doolan, *June 30*, 165–166.
  - Tuberkeen, Dungloe—Applications of G. Ward for Reinstatement, *July 4*, 452 ; *July 7*, 967.
  - Warren's Court Estate, Cork—Application from D. Murphy for Reinstatement, *July 11*, 1214.
- Fair Rents.
  - Appeals, Arrears of -Waste of Time and Money, etc., *July 7*, 995, 997.
  - Enniskillen, Date of Sittings at, *July 4*, 476.
  - Innishowen, Number of Appeals pending from, etc., *June 30*, 150.
  - Kerry, Hearing Delayed Appeals from, *July 5*, 651.
- Finlay, David, Sale of Estate of—Delay in Proceedings, alleged, *July 4*, 474 ; *July 7*, 972.
- Fish, Cured, American Import Duty on—Inducing Withdrawal, proposed, *July 6*, 794 ; *July 7*, 967.
- Fisheries.
  - Fish-Curing Stations on West Coast, Conditions made by Congested Districts Board for Letting, *July 4*, 483.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*
- Fisheries—*cont.*
  - Portasantal, Construction of Sea Wall and Boat Slip at, *July 5*, 633
  - South East Coast, Condition of Industry on, *July 4*, 450 ; *July 11*, 1210.
- Galway.
  - Evicted Tenants in — Numbers of Applications and Re-instatements, etc., *July 11*, 1213, 1214.
  - Queen's College—Bachelor of Arts Degree, Number of Candidates taking, from 1899-1903, *July 13*, 1461, 1462, 1482.
- Glen (Kerry) Boat Slip, Expenditure on, etc., *July 12*, 1364.
- Glenties Workhouse — Improvement in Sanitary Arrangements, proposed, *July 12*, 1352.
- Granville Knox Estate, Mayo, Sale of—Memorial from Tenants, *July 11*, 1213.
- Greencastle Police Force, Re-instating Sergeant Gallagher in Charge of, *July 5*, 653-654.
- Harlech Estate, Sligo—Sale of Grazing Farm over Heads of Tenants, making Inquiry into, etc., *July 5*, 656, 657.
- Hickson Estate, Kerry — Proceedings against Tenants—Demand for hanging Gale, etc., *June 30*, 167–168.
- Innishowen District, Fair Rent Appeals from, etc., *June 30*, 150.
- Irish Agricultural Organisation Society, Payments to, by Agricultural Department—Reasons for, etc., *June 29*, 22 ; *July 6*, 792, 793.
- Irish Language, Teaching of, in Schools, Payment for, *July 13*, 1485.
- Kanturk Land Appeals, Reason for Hearing in Killarney, *July 12*, 1365.
- Kenmare Estate, Sale of—Applications received, &c., *July 7*, 961, 962.
- Kerry.
  - Fair Rent Appeals from—Hearing Delayed Appeals, *July 5*, 651.
  - Parish Committees, Exclusion of Shopkeepers from—Reason for Rule — Suggested Withdrawal, *June 30*, 172.
  - South, Congested Estates for Sale in —Number — Price Demanded, *July 4*, 479.
- Kilclooney Burial Ground, Enlargement of—Price asked for Land by Congested Districts Board, *June 30*, 173.
- Kilrusheightey, Principal Teacher of, Income of—Teacher of—Payment for Tuition in Agriculture, Interpretation of Rule 200, &c., *July 5*, 646-648 ; *July 12*, 1360, 1361.
- King-Harman (Kenagh) Estate, Number of Sales on, etc., *July 4*, 449.

[*cont.*

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*
  Kingston Estate, Purchase of Portion of, by Tenants — Enforcing Landlord's Terms, etc., *June 29*, 24.
  Kinvara — Improvement in Pier and Harbour, proposed, *July 7*, 963.
  Labourers' Cottages.
    Cashel Rural District — Delay in Erecting Cottage for W. Carroll, *July 11*, 1195.
    Castleblayney Union — Arbitrator's Award for Land—Alleged interested Decision, etc., *June 29*, 25, 26.
    Cost of providing Additional Half-acres, *July 11*, 1213.
    Schemes—Number framed, etc., *July 7*, 947, 970.
    Strabane—Case of Henry McCool *July 12*, 1366.
  Labourers (Ireland) Act, Cost of Registration of Title under, &c., *July 6*, 802.
  Labourers (Ireland) Bill—Motion to Commit to Standing Committee on Trade, *July 8*, 1094, 1098, 1102.
  Land Act of 1903, Working of, *July 7* 994, 997.
  Land Appeals — Kanturk, Reason for Hearing Appeals from, n Killarney, *July 12*, 1365.
  Land Commission, Report of, Delay in Presenting, *July 7*, 994, 995.
  Land (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 8*, 1131.
  Land Judge's Court.
    Blakeney Estate, Galway, Position of —Name of Agent or Receiver, *June 30*, 174.
    Sherlock Estate, Cork — Affording Opportunity for Tenants to purchase Holdings, *July 11*, 1196.
  Land Purchase.
    Ballinacross, Farm of Mr. J. Robinson at, Application for Sale, *July 6*, 776.
    Ballydonlon Estate, Sale of—Increase in Instalment Rentals—Holding Inspection, etc., *July 4*, 472.
    Bateman Estate, Tralee—Demand for Gale Rents—Forcing Tenants to Accept Landlord's Terms, etc., *June 30*, 167–169.
    Blakeney Estate, Galway, Taking Advantage of the Act for — Receiver, etc., *July 5*, 650.
    Business transacted between the Estate Commissioners and Land Judge, State of, *July 7*, 1000.
    Carnane Estate—Addition of Name of Owner in order to identify Estate, *July 7*, 963.
    Comyn Kenny Estate, Tenant Purchasers of—Enlarging Uneconomic Holdings, etc., *July 5*, 655.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*
  Land Purchase—*cont.*
    Congested Districts Board, Number of Estates Purchased by, *July 7*, 1001.
    Dernageas Farm, Suggested Purchase of, to Enlarge Small Holdings, etc., *June 29*, 22.
    Dowling, Thomas, Estate of—Terms of Sale, Withdrawal of Village of Cappawhite, etc., *July 7*, 965.
    Estates Commissioners.
      Inspectors — Number, Religious Denomination, etc., *July 13*, 1483, 1484.
      Work in Office of — Allowing Inspectors to furnish Reports without Minute Particulars, *July 11*, 1194.
    Finlay, David, Sale of Estate of—Delay in Proceedings, Alleged, *July 4*, 474; *July 7*, 972.
    Granville Knox Estate, Mayo, Sale of—Memorial from Tenants, *July 11*, 1213.
    Harlech Estate, Sligo—Sale of Grazing Farm over Heads of Tenants, Making Inquiry into, etc., *July 5*, 656, 657.
    Hickson Estate, Kerry—Proceedings against Tenants — Demand for Hanging Gale, etc., *June 30*, 167–168.
    Kenmare Estate, Applications for Sale received, etc., *July 7*, 961, 962.
    King-Harman (Kenagh) Estate, Number of Sales on, etc., *July 4*, 449.
    Kingston Estate, Purchase of Portion of, by Tenants—Enforcing Landlord's Terms, etc., *June 29*, 24.
    M'Cartie Estate, Kerry—Proceedings for Recovery of Rent — Taking Steps to purchase Estate, etc., *June 30*, 167–168.
    McGillycuddy Estate, Sale of—Exclusion of certain Tenants, *July 4*, 484.
    O'Brien Estate, Sale of—Position of Negotiations, *July 6*, 776.
    Palmer's Estate, Purchase of, *July 4*, 477.
    Rae Estate, Sale of—Present Position of Negotiations, *July 12*, 1366.
    Sea, Estates adjoining — Authority responsible for Upkeep of Banks for Tenant Purchasers, *June 29*, 28.
    Sligo—Estates purchased by Congested Districts Board, *July 5*, 656.
    Staff, Strength and Salaries of, *July 7*, 997, 998.
    Terms enforced by Landlords—Payment of Hanging Gate, etc., *July 7*, 1012.
    Untenanted Land, Question of Bonus on, *July 7*, 998, 999.

[*cont.*

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*
- Land Purchase—*cont.*
  - Westropp Estate, Clare.
    - Expediting Sale of, *July 5*, 652.
    - Offers to Tenants, etc., *July 12*, 1364.
- Larne Urban District Council, Application from, for increase in number of Councillors, *July 6*, 797.
- Leagh, Lough, Land Proprietors' Meeting in District of—Election of Trustees for Drainage Works, *July 4*, 481-482.
- Leixlip Burial Ground, Acquiring Additional Land for, *July 4*, 451.
- Listellick Farm, Kerry, Purchase of, by Congested Districts Board, *June 30*, 169.
- Loan Fund Banks, Debenture Holders of, Refunding Money lost by, *July 11*, 1193.
- Londonderry—Magee College—Bachelor of Arts degree, Number of Candidates taking from 1899-1903, *July 13*, 1461, 1462, 1482.
- Longford.
  - Drainage of Tributary from Mullagharowmeen to Camlin River *July 5*, 632.
  - Paupers, English and Scotch, deported to, *July 5*, 632.
- Lurgan—Victoria Street National School, Salary of Teacher at, *July 13*, 1468-1469.
- M'Cartie Estate, Kerry—Proceedings for Recovery of Rent—Taking Steps to purchase Estate, etc., *June 30*, 167-168.
- McGillycuddy Estate, Sale of.
  - Exclusion of certain Tenants, *July 4*, 484.
  - Reinstatement of Evicted Tenant, *July 6*, 793, 794.
- Magherafelt — Salters' Company Trust, Administration of, *July 11*, 1215; *July 13*, 1488.
- Magistrates and Justices of the Peace—Miltown Malbay, Election of Petty Sessions Clerk at — Attendance of Magistrates, Validity of Votes, etc., *July 7*, 969.
- Marine Works Bill, Introduction of, proposed, *July 7*, 1025.
- Maryborough, Confiscation of Gun of Mr. P. Dowling at, etc., *July 5*, 654.
- Mayo Harbour Works, Government Advances for, etc., *July 4*, 479-480.
- Millstreet Barracks—Lodging-out Allowances.
  - Abolishing Station as District Head Quarters, *June 29*, 25, 26.
  - Names of Constables occupying Barracks, etc., *July 7*, 971.
- Miltown Malbay—Irregularities at Election of Petty Sessions Clerk, alleged, *July 5*, 655, 656; *July 7*, 970.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*
- Moy district.
  - House-to-house Inquiry by Police, alleged, *July 7*, 952.
  - Nationalist Demonstration—Allowing Procession to Proceed by Road from Trew to Moy Station, *July 11*, 1212.
- Muir Bay, Trawling in, Within Prohibited Area, alleged—Date of Visit of the "Granuaile," etc., *July 6*, 799.
- Munster Dairy School—Delay in carrying out Improvements, *July 5*, 649.
- Naas Workhouse—Destruction of Whiskey Polluted with Impure Water—Refunding Duty proposed, *July 12*, 1355.
- National School Teachers, Ireland.
  - Assistant Teachers.
    - Number, Promotion Regulations, etc., *July 12*, 1354.
    - Pay — Granting Second Grade Salary to Ten Years' Service Teachers, *June 29*, 27; *July 12*, 1354.
  - Ballynaclosha Principal Teacher, Income of, etc., *July 4*, 449; *July 5*, 630.
  - Contributions by, to Upkeep of Schools 1900-1904, Granting Return showing, *July 5*, 630.
  - Junior Literary Assistants, Pensions for, proposed, *July 12*, 1353.
  - Kilrusheightey—Income of Principal Teacher—Payment for Tuition in Agriculture, *July 5*, 646-648; *July 12*, 1360, 1361.
  - Lurgan — Victoria Street—Salary of Teacher, *July 13*, 1468-1469.
  - Promotions—Record of Teachers promoted, 1900-1903, *July 4*, 479.
  - Salaries.
    - Down County, Principal Teacher of—Claim to Increment, *July 4*, 451.
    - Increasing, to Standard of English Teachers, *July 5*, 658.
- O'Brien Estate, Sale of—Position of Negotiations, *July 6*, 776.
- Owenmore River, Drainage of—Grant proposed, *July 5*, 657; *July 7*, 965.
- Palmer's Estate, Purchase of, *July 4*, 477.
- Peat.
  - Factory at Inny Junction, Success of, etc., *July 4*, 450.
  - Gas Produced from—Success of Experiments—Establishing Industry in Ireland, *July 4*, 450.
- Piers and Harbours.
  - County Councils, Transfer of Powers to, from Harbour Authorities, Introducing Bill for, *July 1*, 318; *July 11*, 1210.
  - Kinvara — Improvements proposed, *July 7*, 963.
  - Mayo, Government Advances for Harbour Works in, etc., *July 4*, 479-480.

[*cont.*

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*
- Poor Law.
  - Ballinasloe—Salary of Dr. Collins as Medical Officer, *July 6*, 800; *July 13*, 1467.
  - Belfast Union—Pension of Mr. J. C. Neeson—Amount, basis of calculation, etc., *July 8*, 1092.
- Poor Law Medical Officers' Superannuation Bill, Providing Facilities for Passage of, *July 11*, 1194.
- Port santal, Construction of Sea Wall and Boat Slip at, *July 5*, 633.
- Queen's Colleges.
  - Bachelor of Arts Degree—Number of Candidates passing Examinations (1899-1903), *July 13*, 1461-1462, 1482.
  - Session, Duration of, etc., *July 12*, 1362, 1363.
- Rae Estate, Kerry, Proposed Purchase of, by Congested Districts Board, *June 30*, 174; *July 12*, 1366.
- Railways.
  - Ballinascarthy and Timoleague Light Railway—County Guarantee of Company, Levying Rate for Dividend on, *July 5*, 631.
  - Burtonport—Gross Earnings per mile per week, etc., *June 30*, 149.
- Rathmines Commissioners, Appeal of, against the Dublin County Council—Advice of Law Officers of the Crown, *July 4*, 471, 472; *July 6*, 799.
- Rattigan's Estate, Edgeworthstown, Evictions on—Attitude of Tenants, etc., *June 29*, 21.
- Roundstone—Flags displayed on Licensed Premises prohibited by Constables, alleged, *July 6*, 778.
- Royal University—Bachelor of Arts Degree, Number of Candidates from Queen's Colleges, &c., taking (1899-1903), *July 13*, 1461-1462, 1482.
- Sherlock Estate, Cork—Affording Opportunity for Tenants to purchase Holdings, *July 11*, 1196.
- Shinrone, King's County, Evictions at—Case of A. P. Doolan, *June 30*, 165-166.
- Sligo—Estates purchased by Congested Districts Board in—Purchase Money, etc., *July 5*, 624, 656.
- Strabane, Labourers' Cottages Scheme at—Case of Henry McCool, *July 12*, 1366.
- Strokestown, Drainage of Rivers in District of, *July 5*, 646.
- Tallow—Extra Police requisitioned for one day—Reason, Payment of expense, etc., *July 7*, 969.
- Tobacco cultivation experiments, Arrangements for, *July 6*, 798.
- Trawling—Muir Bay, Illegal trawling in, alleged—Date of Visit of the "Granuaile," etc., *July 6*, 799.
- Tuberkeen, Dungloe, Evictions at—Application of G. Ward for Re-instatement, *July 4*, 452; *July 7*, 967.
- Ulster, Party Demonstrations in—Maintenance of Public Peace, *June 29*, 22.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*
- Valentia Ferry, Improvement of—Delay in formulating scheme, Alleged, *July 7*, 967.
- Warren's Court Estate, Cork, Sale of—Re-instating D. Murphy, *July 11*, 1214.
- Westropp Estate, Clare, Expediting Sale of, *July 5*, 652; *July 12*, 1364.
- Wicklow Camp Canteen Licence—Action of Mr. Shank, *June 30*, 171; *July 11*, 1215.
- Workhouses.
  - Classification of, Basis of, *July 4*, 476.
  - Naas—Destruction of Whiskey polluted with impure water—Refunding Duty proposed, *July 12*, 1355.
  - Sanitary Condition—Improvement in, and Inspection by Medical Men, proposed, *July 12*, 1352.

Yeomanry
- Arming of, Deficiencies in—Provision of Steel Weapon, Objections to the Bayonet, etc.
  - *Os.* Lord Ashburton, *July 5*, 606-608; Lord Willoughby de Broke, 608-610; Earl of Lonsdale, 610; Earl of Donoughmore, 611; Lord Tweedmouth, 612-614; Earl Roberts, 614-616.
- Character of, as a mounted force.
  - *Os.* Lord Ashburton, *July 5*, 607; Lord Willoughby de Broke, 609; Earl of Donoughmore, 611.
- Lovat Scouts—Armament, position, etc.—Postponement of motion of Earl of Wemyss.
  - *O.* Earl of Wemyss, *July 4*, 392.
- South African Clasps, Cause of Delay in Issue of.
  - *Q.* Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *July 5*, 624.
- Staff Officers, Number available for.
  - *O.* Lord Lovat, *July 8*, 1062.

Yorkshire
- Sowerby Parliamentary By election—New Member sworn, *July 5*, 659.

Young, Mr. S. [Cavan, E.]
- Sugar—Brussels Convention, Expenditure on, Details of, *July 6*, 788.

Yoxall, Mr. J. H. [Nottingham, W.]
- Civil Service, Retirement Regulations, *July 11*, 1187.
- Licensing Bill.
  - *Com.*, *July 12*, 1407.
  - Procedure Resolution, *July 5*, 667.
- Navy, Schoolmasters in, Improving *Status* and Pay of, *July 11*, 1191.
- Trade Reports, Reasons for Delay in Printing, *July 1*, 318.

Zanzibar
- Regent of, Complaints as to Proceedings of, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Earl Percy, *July 11*, 1204.
- Sultan, Minority of—Arrangements for Direction of Affairs.
  - *Q.* Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Earl Percy, *July 7*, 950.